

# THE EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY

(Continuation of *Eastern Churches Number of "Pax,"*  
founded 1931.)

---

VOL. IV

JAN.-APRIL, 1941

No. 6

---

## THE PLATONIC TRADITION AND ST. THOMAS AQUINAS

PREVIOUS *E.C.Q.* writers on the Platonic Tradition have stressed its acosmism, its flight from the flesh, its depreciation of matter in general and of the human body in particular. Indeed, Dom Bede Griffiths has set the Platonic Tradition, understood as the sum of these characteristics, into sharp contrast with, and even opposition to, the sacramentalism of the Christian creeds and the Christian liturgy.<sup>1</sup>

That these characteristics are conspicuous in many, if not most, of those writings which we commonly associate with the Platonic Tradition is undeniable. Nor can it be disputed that these features, to the extent that they have been indiscriminately and uncritically assimilated into Christian spirituality, have (in the words of Dom Griffiths) "tended to draw Christian mysticism away from its sacramental and corporate, in a word its incarnational character, and to make it appear a solitary and ascetic ideal."

Yet it must be asked if it is indeed in such characteristics as these—purely negative as they are—that the essence of Platonism consists. The indisputable fact that Christian reflection, from the earliest times to our own, has ever found "a loving nurse in the Platonick philosophy" can hardly be adequately explained by its belief (itself so doubtfully Christian) that human perfection "consists in the liberation of the soul from the body" and in the "consequent" assimilation to God. Indeed, Karl Barth has argued with much plausibility that it was by the acceptance of precisely this element of Platonism

<sup>1</sup> See *The Platonic Tradition and the Liturgy*, *E.C.Q.*, Jan. 1940, pp. 5 ff.

by Christian theologians that they corrupted the purity of the Gospel of divine Grace and condescension.<sup>1</sup>

It is clear that we must look deeper for the reason for the "fascination" which Platonism has exercised on Christian thinkers, and for the essence of Platonism itself. Perhaps it may seem arbitrary to attempt to distinguish in so complex a historical phenomenon as the Platonic tradition what is primary, essential and positive from what is secondary, incidental and negative. Yet it can be shown, and in the view of the present writer shown conclusively, that the acosmic and negative features of the Platonic tradition, and indeed of Plato himself, are but secondary corollaries, imperfectly apprehended, of a positive vision in which we must find the real core of Plato's teaching and the living thread of continuity which underlies the Platonic tradition. And that core of truth, that positive vision and the attitude of mind which it fosters, so far from being anti-sacramental, is precisely and in the highest degree sacramental.

For it is surely in his exemplarism, in his doctrine of the Ideas and their participation by the world of phenomena, in the famous parable of the shadow in the cave, that we are to find the essential characteristic of Plato's philosophy; the indispensable highest common factor of all that we can describe as Platonic and which underlies all the changing and sometimes contradictory variations which have appeared and disappeared within the Platonic tradition. Platonism is notoriously difficult to define; it has well been argued that it designates an attitude of mind rather than a philosophical system. But that attitude of mind is the outcome of that elemental vision of this world of phenomena as the shadow and reflection of a higher world of reality. However we may interpret Plato's Ideas (and his own interpretation of them varies considerably from Dialogue to Dialogue), the Platonic world-view consists essentially in its interpretation

<sup>1</sup> See *The Holy Ghost and the Christian Life*, pp. 12, sq. The kernel of the argument consists in the fact that whereas Christianity consists in the acceptance by faith of God's descent among men (and for Barth with his solidarianism, in nothing else), Platonism assumes that man can ascend to God by ascetic and psychic "works." There does seem to be some justice in the charge that St. Augustine never succeeded, or even attempted, to reconcile his strong teaching on the necessity of grace and his uncompromising anti-Pelagianism with the ascetico-mystical teaching which he had taken from Plotinus. The Barthian onslaught on Christian Platonism is doubtless answerable; but it deserves far more serious consideration from Christian Platonists than it has yet received. It will need a re-examination of the whole question of Grace and Nature, and it seems probable that Eastern theology will be found of immense value in supplementing the inadequacies of some current Western presentations.

of this world as an imitation, a participation, a shadow, and thus as a symbol, a sign, a sacrament, of a transcendental world of pure intelligibility and immateriality. Plato, it is true, did not originate this view of the world as symbol. His significance in history lies less in his originality than in the fact that it was given to him first to formulate human reflection on the emergence of the human psyche from its primitive condition of *participation mystique* (to employ Lévy-Bruhl's brilliant designation of the primitive mentality) with natural phenomena and natural forces. Plato, as Dr. Inge has shown in a fine passage, was but the spokesman of a vast psychical movement which spread from Asia to Europe, and which brought about the appearance of the transcendental world-religions in the revolt of man from primitive animism and fertility-cult. "The essence of the new movement" (writes Dr. Inge) "was in the recognition of an unseen world of unchanging reality behind the flux of phenomena, a spiritual universe compared with which the world of opinion grew pale and unsubstantial and became only a symbol or even an illusion. . . . This mystical faith . . . appears in the Greek lands as Orphism and Pythagoreanism. . . . But it is in Plato, the disciple of the Pythagoreans as well as of Socrates [the reference is to Socrates' discovery of the immateriality of the concept], that this conception of an unseen eternal world, of which the visible world is only a pale copy, gains a permanent foothold in the West. What, he asked, if man had eyes to see that pure Beauty, unalloyed with the stains of material existence, would he not travel thither, happy as a captive released from the prison house? Such was the call which, once heard, has never long been forgotten in Europe."<sup>1</sup>

Platonism in its earlier forms did indeed involve an "*escape from*" the body and from matter, but only because that was supposed to be the indispensable condition of a positive "*call to*" the contemplation of a reality beyond, behind and above the merely material.

It is easy to understand how, from the earliest days, that call has found a response in the Christian Church. Plato's "realm of Ideas" might well seem, as it seemed to St. Augustine, a foreshadowing of Christ's Kingdom "not of this world"; and well might it be supposed that, as Moses was a pedagogue to bring the Chosen People to Christ, so Provi-

<sup>1</sup> W. R. Inge, *The Platonic Tradition in English Religious Thought*, pp. 7-10.

dence had disposed that Plato should fulfil the same task for the Gentiles.<sup>1</sup>

From the first, it is true, the impact of Christianity and Platonism involved a modification of the latter. The identification of the Ideas with the Divine substance of Jehovah had already been essayed by the Jew Philo, and early Christian thought was much occupied with this adaptation of historic Platonism to the exigencies of orthodox monotheism. The doctrine of the Incarnation and the Resurrection demanded further trimmings of the secondary and negative features of Platonism. Yet St. Augustine was surely right in seeing the Incarnation as the completion and correction of the Platonic world-view rather than as its negation.<sup>2</sup> For Augustine this was no mere academic theorising; it was Plato and the neo-Platonists who had led him to the Logos, though they could never teach him that the Logos was made flesh.

Certain it is that the essentially Platonic and sacramental view of the material world as symbol dominated the Christian and European consciousness until the rediscovery of Aristotle at the beginning of the thirteenth century. How profound a revolution that rediscovery was to effect it is still impossible to assess, for its full evolution is still unachieved.<sup>3</sup> But so accustomed have we become to our "modern consciousness" with its essentially Aristotelian assumption that this sublunar world is of value and interest in itself, and not merely as the reflection of the transcendental, that it is difficult for us to understand the alarm which greeted the propagation of Aristotle's philosophy in those far-off days. It is easy for us to laugh at the opposition with which the efforts of Albert the Great and Thomas Aquinas to "baptise" Aristotle were confronted, but the very fact that it is possible to laugh is some measure of the success of their efforts and of the immensity of the task which they undertook.

For just as Christians had traditionally found themselves at home in Plato's philosophy, so had they always tended to look askance at Plato's mocking disciple Aristotle. For Aristotle, with untiring petulance, had poured unremitting scorn on the Platonic Ideas, and by his doctrine of the inherence of form in matter had seemed to make this world its own explanation. The practical implications of Aristotle's

<sup>1</sup> See, e.g., *Contra Academicos*, III, xix, 42. But cf. his *Retractationes*.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Confessiones*, VII 10.

<sup>3</sup> See M. D. Chenu, O.P., *The Intellectualist Revolution of St. Albert and St. Thomas*, in *Blackfriars*, Jan. 1938.

hylemorphism<sup>1</sup> might well seem as disastrous to the whole setting of Christian faith and practice as Plato's other-worldly Ideas had seemed congenial. For the effect of Aristotle's doctrine was to keep the eye of man fixed downwards to the things of earth, where the effect of Plato's doctrine was to raise his eyes to heavenly reality. So long as Plato ruled Europe, science, begotten as it is of the conviction that the explanation of things is to be found *within* things, was impossible. With the rediscovery of Aristotle, the modern scientific temper was born; but it was a birth which the traditional theologians had all too good reason to fear would sound the death-knell of faith, of medieval man's innate sense of the symbolism of sensible reality. This was fully realised by the shrewder critics of the Aristotelian renascence in the thirteenth century itself. Thus St. Bonaventure is at pains to show how all the real or alleged errors of the Aristotelians are reducible to their denial of the Ideas. All the pagan philosophers, St. Bonaventure admitted, were in darkness, for they knew not the Logos made flesh. But Plato, by his doctrine of exemplarism, pointed the way to the Logos; he *knew* he was in the darkness and could see only the shadows on the wall of the cave; he made no attempt to offer a complete and systematised philosophy which would find the ultimate explanation of the world within the world itself. Aristotle, on the other hand, had indeed been forced by reason to acknowledge the existence of a transcendental God; but it was a remote God who had nothing to do with the world, a mere postulate dragged in to explain the supposed fact of the eternal motion of matter. The very completeness of Aristotelianism as a self-sufficient philosophy was for St. Bonaventure its condemnation; this alone was sufficient to brand Aristotle as the incarnation of the pride and arrogance of unaided human reason. Aristotle was in the *outer* darkness; for his philosophy precluded the entry of the Word by its own claim to completeness and autonomy.<sup>2</sup>

Perhaps St. Thomas Aquinas made no greater contribution to the history of human thought than by his painstaking synthesis of Plato and Aristotle. Yet perhaps no element in his thought has received less consideration from students of his work. Certain it is that this work of synthesis was to

<sup>1</sup> The characteristic doctrine of Aristotle that form as well as matter is inherent *within* corporeal reality.

<sup>2</sup> *Collationes in Hexaemeron*, VI. Cf. *La philosophie de saint Bonaventure*, by Etienne Gilson, for a full account of St. Bonaventure's attitude towards Plato and Aristotle.

believe those misgivings of St. Bonaventure and his colleagues in the old Platonist-Augustinian tradition of theology, and at the same time to open up the possibility of an attitude towards this world which would acknowledge it as of interest and value in itself without prejudice to its significance as a symbol of eternal Truth, Goodness and Beauty.

Too easily do we label St. Thomas as an "Aristotelian" and hastily assume that on that account he is of no concern to the Platonist and had no contribution to make to the evolution of the Platonic tradition. Or we fall into the opposite extreme and with M. Durantel call St. Thomas "un platonicien honteux,"<sup>1</sup> or assert with Dr. Inge that "St. Thomas is nearer to Plotinus than to the real Aristotle."<sup>2</sup> The facts are far more complex than such over-simplifications would suggest. The streams of Platonism and Aristotelianism had indeed often crossed and recrossed before St. Thomas, and elements from each had sometimes intermingled in more or less happy harmony. But in St. Thomas they fuse as they had never fused before ; and, for the first time, to their mutual advantage.

This may seem a bold assertion ; and it is one which it would take a volume to establish. It is a task which would compel us to undertake a detailed examination of the whole corpus of the saint's writings, beginning with his commentaries on the *Physics* and *Metaphysics* of Aristotle on the one side and on the *Divine Names* of the pseudo-Areopagite and the *De Causis* of Proclus on the other, and ending with a close scrutiny of his own magisterial conclusions on the points at issue in his *Summae* and *Quaestiones Disputatae*. Such a task would clearly take us far beyond the compass of this brief article ; but it may be possible to suggest the main lines along which such an investigation would lead us and the conclusions which, in the view of the present writer, it would be possible to draw.

In view of the persistence and intransigence with which Aristotle had attacked Plato's Ideas it is rather astonishing to find St. Thomas asserting that "Aristotle made explicit what Plato was groping for, to wit that the Ideas are in the Divine Mind."<sup>3</sup> That was written when St. Thomas was still in his 'teens, and we do not find so bold an assertion repeated in his more mature works. But it does indicate an early intuition that not only was Aristotle's philosophy—

<sup>1</sup> *Le retour à Dieu*, p. 228.

<sup>2</sup> *The Philosophy of Plotinus* (2nd. edn.), Vol. I, p. 15.

<sup>3</sup> *Commentary on the Sentences*, I, XXXVI, ii, 1 ad 1um.

in spite of appearances—not antagonistic to the Platonic doctrine of exemplarism in its monotheistic and Christian form, but that the doctrine of Christian Platonism could in fact be deduced from Aristotle's own principles. Hence in his commentaries on the *Physics* and *Metaphysics* we find St. Thomas subjecting Aristotle's arguments against Plato's Ideas to a critical analysis whose freedom may well astonish those who accuse the saint of excessive subservience to the Stagyrite. He shows in turn how the various arguments brought forward by Aristotle, though valid against a theory (the theory which Aristotle attributed to Plato himself) which would make of the Ideas distinct hypostases, have no conclusive weight against the Ideas as such nor against the contention of Christian Platonism that they are ontologically identical with the Divine Substance. Other arguments adduced by Aristotle, St. Thomas shows, on Aristotle's own admission,<sup>1</sup> to be directed not against Plato's conclusions but solely against the logical accuracy of his reasoning.

Parallel with this negative defence of Christian exemplarism in the commentaries on Aristotle, we find in St. Thomas's commentaries on the neo-Platonic works of the pseudo-Denys and of Proclus the most formal and express endorsement of their exemplarist teaching, and already an effort to establish that teaching logically and scientifically on a solid metaphysical basis.

And in this especially we may see St. Thomas's great contribution to the Platonic tradition. In Plato himself and in the great Platonic writers previous to St. Thomas, the doctrine of exemplarism is stated and restated, but seldom if ever proved. St. Thomas set out to show that Aristotle's metaphysical principles of *energeia* and *dynamis*, and more especially their expression in final causality (*finis operationis*), precisely demand the Platonic Ideas, and that conversely Plato's brilliant intuition was (whatever Aristotle himself may have thought about it) the necessary logical consequence of Aristotle's own metaphysical premisses. For he was not content merely to show that Plato's "realm of Ideas" as

<sup>1</sup> *Metaphysics*, 990b. 10. St. Thomas sums up his own conclusions regarding Aristotle's criticisms of Plato by saying that, "although they refute the exemplars which Plato believed in, they are in no wise at variance with the truth that God's wisdom is the exemplar of all things." (*Comm. on the Metaphysics*, I. 15, §233.) That Plato himself really "believed in" the hypostasised Ideas which Aristotle attacked is, of course, highly disputable; there are passages in the Dialogues which might seem to support it among many others hardly compatible with such a belief. The strongest argument in favour of this is the testimony of Aristotle himself.

reinterpreted by the Christian Platonists was not in contradiction with Aristotle; he showed that Christian Platonism required Aristotle to justify its own doctrines with logical and metaphysical rigour as well as to save it from the acosmic errors of pagan Platonism, and at the same time that Aristotelianism stood in need of Christian Platonism as the logical conclusion of its own principles and to save it from that philosophical immanentalism and unbalanced "this-worldliness" of the pagan Aristotelians which were so justifiably alarming the pastors and masters of Christendom. He showed, in short, that Aristotelianism and Platonism, so far from being eternally irreconcilable (as St. Bonaventure, for instance, had imagined), were mutually necessary and mutually complementary; and that in the synthesis of the two the erroneous tendencies of each were automatically corrected by the other.

The space at our disposal in this article permits us to do no more than boldly to assert that St. Thomas did in fact achieve all this; we could prove it only by a vast array and careful analysis of the relevant texts. Still less is it possible for us to follow St. Thomas in his further treatment of the problems to which the doctrine of exemplar Ideas gives rise. Mention must however be made of his profound and subtle, yet—when once understood—dazzlingly obvious solution of the problem which had so long haunted Christian Platonism: the problem of reconciling the multiplicity of the Ideas with their identity with the unity and simplicity of the Divine Essence. It must suffice to say that this solution (sadly misunderstood and misinterpreted by some of the most distinguished later Thomists) avoids at once the pitfalls of regarding them as either "really" (in the sense of ontologically) or merely "rationally" distinct, and finds it in God's own perception of His multiple "imitableness" in an actually multiple creation. The multiplicity of the Ideas is thus not a mere fiction of the human mind, nor are they distinct entities; but they are multiple *secundum munus ideandi*:<sup>1</sup> i.e. precisely as Ideas, for an Idea as such is less an entity than a function, an "extrinsic formal cause."

Nor can we do more than mention St. Thomas's thought on the causality of the Ideas, nor show how, by invoking Aristotle's principles, he turns the tables on Aristotle's own argument that Plato's Ideas, because static, cannot account for Becoming. Nor his profound treatment of the relationship of the Ideas to matter, in which he shows how Aristotle's hylemorphism, while not conflicting with Platonic exem-

<sup>1</sup> John of St. Thomas, *Comm. on the Summa Theologica*, Part I, Q. 15.

plarism, precisely corrects the latter from those acosmic and manichaeian tendencies which have always rendered it suspect of incompatibility with the Christian doctrines of the Creation and Incarnation.

But enough has perhaps been said to indicate the vital importance of this aspect of St. Thomas's work, and the valuable material it contains for labourers in the eirenic movement of East and West. Too easily, perhaps, do our brethren in the East dismiss Aquinas as an Aristotelian and a cataphatic theologian without sympathy with or understanding of their own Platonic tradition, forgetful of his reverent schooling in apophatic theology in the works of that "Denys" whom Fr. Basil Krivoshein (in the *E.C.Q.*) has described as the greatest of apophatic theologians. That this is so, is perhaps due to nothing so much as the emphasis which has been laid by Western exponents on the Aristotelianism (and all that that implies) of St. Thomas at the expense of his Platonism. It will be no less a service to ourselves in the West than to the East if we are brought to a rediscovery and reappreciation of our own neglected heritage.

VICTOR WHITE, O.P.

## THE SYRIAN JACOBITES AND THEIR THEOLOGY OF THE SACRAMENTS

### HISTORICAL BACKGROUND.

**T**HIS article has really nothing original to say, and experts can safely leave it aside. It is prompted by a review which should have been made, and was not. The review concerned a book written by Father W. de Vries, S.J., and entitled *Sakramtentheologie bei den Syrischen Monophysiten*. If the review has grown into an article the reason is simply that the very clearness of the book suggested certain thoughts which, even if not in the nature of a "review," might conveniently be grouped around it.

One of the results of disruption is disinterestedness. Catholics and non-Catholics drifted apart, and once separated, lost touch with each other. This lack of contact usually breeds lack of knowledge, lack of knowledge breeds lack of love, and where there is no love there is no desire for union. For many Catholicism has become "insular" and this is

the exact opposite of "Catholic." And thus it has come about that the restoration of Christian Unity cannot be tackled simply and directly by bridging the separated parts, but has to start with stirring up the desire for union. So we have to reverse the process: we must make contact, we must try to know each other, we shall, then, begin to love each other, and once in love, in Christ's love, we shall be able to see our way more clearly towards union, or at least, shall be more open to the working of the Holy Ghost to bring about this union as He thinks fit.

Thinking this over it began to dawn upon me what a great ignorance reigned, not only in my own mind, but also in that of others where non-Catholics are concerned. This is doubtless mutual but not justified thereby. I hope, therefore, I may be forgiven for pointing out a few very simple things.

First the title. I said Jacobites, and Fr. de Vries said Monophysites. This is not the same. All Jacobites may be called Monophysites, and Fr. de Vries has probably used this term because it is theologically clearer. If I used the term Jacobites it is because the author who spent two years in the East tells us that these Syrians loathe the name Monophysites and call themselves always Jacobites, after Jacob Zanzalus (Bürde'ana, or Baradai, "the ragged" from his tattered clothes; he died<sup>1</sup> in 577 after having organised the Monophysite Church). Why these Syrians do not want to be called Monophysites I shall explain further on.

These Jacobites do not comprise all the Monophysites. They are that branch of the Monophysites which has its centre in West Syria, whilst East Syria is the stronghold of the Nestorians. So "Jacobites" is the most exact description of the Christians of whom Fr. de Vries speaks: West Syrian Monophysites.

It might be useful to say a word or two about the Syrians in general. It would be very wrong to consider the Syrians as unimportant, and ignore the rôle they played in history.

Syria, as a country, has had a very troubled history, and as a result, very often changing boundaries. They were, what we style now "small countries." The mistake we make in politics as well as in history is to consider small nations as unimportant. In fact, the Syrians have exercised a powerful influence on both East and West (if we must oppose them), and that precisely because they were a "small nation." They were never an "empire," like the Babylonians, or the Greeks or the Romans or the Franks or the

<sup>1</sup> Cfr. *Heiler*, o.l., p. 455.

British. On the contrary, they were constantly under the sway of one or other of these empires.

This fitful history was partly determined by its geographic position. As Dr. De Lacy O'Leary said so concisely, they were situated on central highlands with a temperate and fertile climate between the Arabian desert, Babylonian torridity and Armenian cold.<sup>1</sup> In the political sphere its geographical situation marked it out as the inevitable meeting ground for imperial cross currents and cross purposes emanating from Babylon, Memphis and Alexandria, Rome and Byzantium, not to mention the Armenians and the Arabs. In so far as Syria has a well-defined history of its own, it was founded by Seleucus Nikator. The Syrians reckoned their dates for a long time according to the Seleucian era, that is, from 1st October 312 B.C. onward. Antioch, founded by Seleucus, was not a centre of stability, was not master of its own fate; it was essentially, as Prof. Cohen says, *un noeud de routes*, a knot of roads;<sup>2</sup> it was a centre of coming and going, of constant moving and acting, of interminable fermentation, of conflict and transition. No wonder that it was a centre of commerce, wealth and their inevitable companions, lightheartedness and voluptuousness.

The Seleucian dynasty ended in civil war which landed the Syrians in the hands of Tigranes of Armenia (83 B.C.) who was himself beaten by Lucullus in 69 B.C. This Roman general put Antiochos XIII on the throne, till, in 64 B.C., Pompey saw the strategic and commercial importance of Syria for the control of the whole East and so made it a Roman province. Zenobia of Palmyra tried with the help of Odeinathos to reconquer independence, but Aurelian put an end to this last effort in A.D. 272-3. Then Chosroe II of Persia incorporates it in his empire, Heraclius reconquers it in 623, but after the battles of Jakuza on the Jarmuk (634) and Gabitha or Gabija (636) it falls for three centuries into the hands of the Arabs (under Khalif Omar). In the Xth century the Fatimides of Egypt took possession, to be followed by the Seldjuks in the XIth. In the XIIIth century the crusaders invade it for a short time till they are dislodged by the Saladins who, in their turn, are displaced, as at the end of the century, the Mameluks take over. In 1517 Syria becomes a Turkish province and remains so till the persecutions of the Christians in 1840, 1845, 1860-61 provoke the not exactly disinterested intervention of Napoleon III. In

<sup>1</sup> *The Syriac Church and Fathers*, London, 1909, S.P.C.K., pp. 9-10.

<sup>2</sup> *La Grèce et l'Hellenisation du monde antique*, Paris, 1930, p. 528.

1920 it becomes a French mandate. Since 1936 definite steps have been taken towards complete autonomy.

The development of the Syrian language and literature follow, though at a distance, the historical developments. Whilst during the Seleucid period Syriac remained the official language of Western Asia and its popular use even spread into Palestine and Egypt, it gradually yielded to the *koinè*, Hellenistic Greek. Seleucus and his successors used to found Hellenistic cities with special urban districts for the Greek colonists. This was the case in Antioch, Seleucia, Laodicea, Beroea and Edessa. It must be noted, however, that apart from the language and the surface of civilization, the Syrians held their ground and exercised a strong influence on the colonists.<sup>1</sup> This is only one instance of the difficulty of assessing the features of Hellenism: its dress, its speech, its international ways and mannerisms, in short, the surface of Hellenistic civilization were Greek in a diluted way, whilst the deeper currents, the values, the contents of this civilization were really unconquered Orientalism. The *koinè* was universally in use in the towns of Syria during the Roman period as we can see from the letters of the great Ignatius of Antioch. But even during this period Syriac continued to exist and flourish in the Eastern parts and in the countryside. The first manifestations of this Syriac literature come from the Beduin kingdom of Edessa: the letter of the Abgar of Edessa to Christ, His reply (both apocryphal), and the narrative of Thaddaeus's (Addai) mission after the Ascension to Edessa. Since the main source of this literary development was ecclesiastic, Syriac spread into the surrounding ecclesiastical spheres, mainly the monastic circles of Egypt where many valuable Syriac manuscripts have been and are still found, and, through the Nestorian missionaries, into the Far East. And so it came about that the Syriac speaking Church was not so much in Western Syria as in Persia and Mesopotamia. Whilst Antioch, after the loss of the Jacobite and Nestorian Churches, fell weakly under the domineering influence of Byzantium, these churches flourished for several centuries. After Ephrem, Philoxenus of Mabbug (Hierapolis, d. 523) was one of the first great masters of Syriac prose. His friend, Jacob of Sarug (d. 541), is considered by the Syrians as one of their greatest poets. They call him the Flute of the Holy Ghost. Lastly, however, the Arabic domination made Arabic the popular language, although it never succeeded in supplanting the Syriac language in the

1 Cfr. De Lacy O'Leary, op. l., p. 23.

Liturgy.<sup>1</sup> The venerable old Syriac language was and still is maintained; but it is only vaguely understood by the people, since it has been withdrawn from profane use.

To characterize a moving and unstable nation is almost an impossibility. Nevertheless it is possible to glean a few features from history which take the subjective aspect off such a judgment. And two features stand out as borne out by facts and documents. The first is that the Syrians, being a "small nation," exercised their influence not so much by political moves as by constant and widespread penetration. The second is that they travelled far and wide in the quality of merchants. On these two points they show their Semitic origin and have much in common with the Jews. It is true that *Syrus* in the old documents often stands for any Oriental. Yet, names and certain generally known facts help us as guides to retrace the steps of the omnipresent genuine Syrians.

Antioch lay on the point where the great international trade-routes crossed. From Lyons and Marseilles, from Rome and Alexandria, the great route from the West passed through Antioch to Persia and India. On the other hand, the richnesses of Arabia, Ethiopia and the South had to pass through Antioch to get to Byzantium and Rome. No wonder that commerce was in the Syrian blood. The wanderings of these Syrian merchants cannot only be traced by inscriptions which mark their first and last resting-place.<sup>2</sup> These wandering Syrians, drifting on the waves of international business routes, were left, like jetsam and flotsam, in almost all the more important ports of the Mediterranean, or were carried farther inland along the great rivers. Once there, they would often settle down either in business or along the wharfs in various qualities, or find service with men of importance. They would always remain foreigners but this would not prevent them from adapting themselves and often starting important careers. The greatest jurists of Rome were Syrians, and as late as the seventh century no less than seven Syrian popes would rule the Church. And the measure of their great and understanding government may surely be seen in the fact that so far from being resented in the "West," they became, without losing their national

<sup>1</sup> The Scriptural lessons, Creed, Lord's Prayer, and certain other prayers of the Liturgy are said or sung in Arabic now.—[Editor.]

<sup>2</sup> References may be found in H. Leclercq's article *Colonies* in *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie*, v. III, p. II, 22 2266 ff. (1914), but since I have not been able to verify them I refer to them *en bloc*.

character, brilliant and capable representatives of the true "Catholic" tradition of Rome. At Ravenna all bishops were Syrians from Apollinaris to Peter (+425).<sup>1</sup> Another way in which Syrians would penetrate would be as soldiers. In this capacity they left their mark in Dalmatia and the Balkan countries, along the Danube, in Germania, in the North of England as well as in the South, in Roman Africa.

The Syrians, thus penetrating throughout the Roman Empire to its most advanced posts on all frontiers, and at the same time into the very heart of Rome, so much so that Syrian influence dominated Roman government from Commodus till the death of Severus Alexander, influenced the civilized world of those days in many ways, right up till Charlemagne. A special study on this subject has, to my knowledge, not yet been attempted although it would be revolutionary in the field of history. Some of the ways in which they left an indelible impress upon Roman civilization begin to stand out in that muddled background of a hundredfold cross currents which is the background of the death of antiquity.

Although the Syrians did not invent the cupola in architecture, they did definitely introduce this new feature into the style of the Old and the New Rome. They brought the cupola to the Sancta Sophia, and with the cupola they brought the arched vault and the bell-tower.<sup>2</sup> In Roman law they furnished Rome with the two greatest jurists of all Roman history, Aemilius Papinianus and Domitius Ulpianus.<sup>3</sup> It is significant for the revolutionary conclusions which a more serious study of Syrian influences would force upon historians of all kinds that Roman law which has so often been made the most important and least attractive feature of Catholicism should receive its most powerful and brilliant contributions from the East, supposedly "unlegalistic." When we hear of the *Dea Syria* being celebrated as far north as the *Vallum Hadriani* in the North of England,<sup>4</sup> we shall be hardly astonished to hear that, once christianized, those Syrian influences come to bear upon the medieval Christian mind, then in the mould. Mr. Bréhier has shown that the substitution of the crucifix for the cross was due to Syrian influences. The Syrians are indeed a nation marked by their devotional ardour.

<sup>1</sup> Agnellus *Liber Pontificalis*, Vita St. Petri, c. l., P.L. CVI, 513.

<sup>2</sup> De Lacy O'Leary, op. l., pp. 21-22.

<sup>3</sup> Hosius and Krüger, Geschichte der Röme Lit. (Schanz) iii, 1922, p. 201, ff.

<sup>4</sup> J. Toutain, *Les cultes païens dans l'Empire Romain*, ii, Paris, 1911, p. 35, ff.

They, too, managed for a large part the relic traffic which is so characteristic of the early Middle Ages. Gregory of Tours relates many an incident of this new kind of business in which Syrians play the main part. And when Guntchramnus enters Orleans (c. 585) he is welcomed with a *Vivat Rex in*, as St. Gregory of Tours says, *lingua Syrorum, hinc Latinorum, hinc etiam ipsorum Judaeorum.*<sup>1</sup>

As international travellers the Syrians had a gift for languages to which authorities and writers had recourse.<sup>2</sup> This use of various languages was indicated by their world-wide trade. This trade covered everything. They brought *mancipia et vasa aenea* from Corinth and Phrygia together with horses, horsemen and mules to Tyre and from thence to Rome, Italy, Spain and Gaul or to the South, to Alexandria, Egypt and Abyssinia. Copper, gold, all kinds of precious metals and their products in the form of statues, shrines, table ware, jewels, silk and precious carpets and garments. All that the *blasé* taste of a decadent civilization could think of for the glitter and glimmer of an empty existence, was furnished or transacted by Syrians. One must forgive the *Doctor irascibilis*, St. Jerome, for resenting this rather piratical and too often unscrupulous exploitation of man's proclivity to sin accentuated by the sense of approaching ruin. With his tender friendships with Roman ladies, young and old, he could not help resenting a business which included white slave traffic and relic traffic as mere items on the bill. In his Letter to Demetriades, one of his *philothees*, he says : " *Hic matrum gremiis abducere pactas ; negotiatoribus et avidissimis mortalium Syris, nobilium puellarum nuptias vendere ; non pupillarum, non viduarum, non virginum Christi inopiae parcere ; magisque manus rogantium spectare quam vultus.*"<sup>3</sup> And again, speaking of their international trade, he writes : " *Habitat ergo, juxta literam Tyrus sive Sor in introitu maris ; vel quod prius insula fuit, vel quod portu tutissimo de alto venientes recepit naves, et est negotiatio popolorum ad insulas multas, sive de insulis multis. Quod quidem usque hodie perseverat ut omnium propemodum gentium in illa exerceantur commercia.*"<sup>4</sup> They were so wealthy themselves that they used the most precious stuff for the very sails of their ships : " *Byssus in Aegypto quam maxime nascitur, ex qua contextum est Tyriae navis velum, quod suspenditur malo, et operimentum illius, quod in solis*

<sup>1</sup> *Historia Francorum*, L. VIII, c. 1., Opera, Paris, 1699.

<sup>2</sup> *Id., Libri Miraculorum*, L. I, in fine c. I.

<sup>3</sup> *Ep. CXXX*, c. 7, written A.D. 414.

<sup>4</sup> *In Ezechielem*, L. VIII, c. 27.

calore atque tranquillo nautis atque vectoribus praebet umbraculum, de hyacintho et purpura fit; quae sunt de insulis Elisa, Jonii maris sic appellans insulas. Porro juxta LXX de byssō in stratum et in requiem Tyriae navis velamenta texuntur, ut his opera gloriosior sit, et circumdata amictum habeat pulchriorem.”<sup>1</sup> As long ago as A.D. 65 Juvenal pictured the way in which the Syrian influence insinuated itself into Roman society :

Iam pridem Syrus in Tiberim defluxit Orontes  
et linguam et mores et cum tibicine chordas  
obliquas nec non gentilia tympana secum  
vexit et ad circum iussas prostare puellas.<sup>2</sup>

And under Diocletian Julius Capitolinus wrote in his life of Verus, the Emperor : “ Quasi reges aliquos ad triumphum adduceret, sic histriones eduxit a Syria . . . , adduxerat secum et fidicines et tibicines et histriones scurrasque mimarios et praestigiatores et omnia mancipiorum genera, quorum Syria et Alexandria pascitur voluptate.”<sup>3</sup>

*The Jacobites.*<sup>4</sup> It is far from easy to determine the exact character of those Christians who call themselves Jacobites. From the *historical* point of view there are several factors which contributed to the formation of this Christian body. And it would be running a fatal risk of misrepresentation to discard these factors. The origin of the Jacobite schism as well as of most schisms is a complex process. It is wrong to take the cynical line which Ernst Stein takes in his otherwise magnificent work *Geschichte des spätromischen Reiches* where there is hardly anything left of the dogmatic question as an important matter for an, after all, Christian supernatural society. It is equally wrong to simplify the matter in a way which gives the impression as if there were but a few deliberately evil-willed heretics who started off with a clear and definite opposition to a clear and well-defined point of Catholic dogma. I will try to arrange a few factors in order without going into detail :

1. First there was the rise or revival of the national spirit in the Eastern and Southern nations. This in itself is already a very complicated question and I, for one, do not pretend to see clear in this matter. The facts are (and here Stein is

<sup>1</sup> In Ezech., *ibid.*

<sup>2</sup> *Satires*, III, 62.

<sup>3</sup> C. 8.

<sup>4</sup> For many details I am indebted to F. Heiler's great work *Urkirche und Ostkirche*, München, 1937, p. 454 ff., where he shows great balance of judgment and quotes approvingly what the more important modern Catholic theologians have established.

right although he suffers from prejudice in his treatment) that the increasingly important rôle of the Church in society released a great number of unecclesiastical forces. It gave thousands of oppressed and uncultured men the opportunity to rise to a social standing which they would not have dreamt of without the Church. Monachism was an outlet in this line, and the rôle of the monks was far from honourable in many a conflict.

2. Then there were the internal conflicts in imperial policy. The rise of the national spirit threatened the empire with disruption. And it is evident from the facts that the Southern and Eastern nations resented the Byzantine domination much more than the Roman.

3. This internal political conflict was fought out more on the ecclesiastical field than elsewhere, and the reason is that in the crumbling civilization of Hellenistic Rome the Church was almost the sole bearer of that assurance of duration and authority which are the backbone of a stable society. So the fight was, unfortunately, a fight between Patriarchal Sees rather than between *comites* and *duces*.

4. The Byzantine court and administration lacked that balance and gentlemanly conduct of international affairs which had been the widely recognized and appreciated mark of Roman government. The reason was that the men called to the highest tasks never had that traditional and cultural formation which the Romans had had for centuries. They were only too often upstarts, parvenus. The result was, of course, a far more important rôle played by intrigue. There had been traditions but Hellenism seems to have absorbed them all.

5. This penetrated into the distribution of charges and dignities, and deeply affected the nomination or election of bishops and patriarchs. There is no possibility of denying that even vulgar bribery played its part in the settlement of dogmatic formulas.

6. But, then, even if the first beginnings were repelling and distorted, one cannot deny, as Stein seems to do, that individuals could be truly and firmly attached to their religious point of view without yielding to the various temptations of social life in those times. This will be still more the case after the first instigators' death, when their followers, rid of the personal motives and passions of their predecessors, definitely see a religious value to be preserved and defended.

Now, all these factors coincide, some of the leading personalities being in the first stage or stages of development, others in the last, and all surrounded by the powerful, though

disreputable, influence of mobs of various dispositions and combinations. Studying history from our clear point of vantage backward we may think everything is clear: dogma is formulated and one accepts or one does not accept, and if one does not accept the formula one is a heretic. But if one tries to study history by starting at the beginning and trying to live oneself into the developments of facts and persons a very different picture is shown, although the conclusions concerning the truth of revelation remain unaltered. In this latter sense, the story of Ephesus and Chalcedon is not the story of two completely separated Councils, peacefully and independently settling a point of discussion, but the story of one development of various factors, a development which makes things time and again come to a head; there is continuity and one event leads to another, sometimes in most unexpected ways.

In 325 the great Athanasius had won the battle against a widespread and mainly subconscious kind of narrow monotheism which would make the threefoldness of the Divine Persons incompatible with the oneness of their nature. That was the meaning of Arius' attack on Christ's Divinity. It had other manifestations in Sabellianism and other early heresies. The victory of Nicaea was not merely the victory of Christ's divinity, it was implicitly the victory of the Trinity over an exclusive and pre-Christian monotheism. Perhaps the Jews, who were such a potent factor, in the first centuries as now, in the struggle against Christianity were responsible for this Judaistic monotheism. But if Nicaea had spoken, the fight of Arius, Arians and semi-Arians had not stopped for that. In this heated atmosphere of the fourth century one could hardly expect an immediate restoration of balance and peace. And so it does not seem exotic that some, in their fervour, carried the defence of Christ's Godhead on to a diminution of His manhood. Apollinaris of Laodicea was one of those most responsible for this pushing of Nicaea to an unasked-for extreme. This broke again the *analogia fidei*, the harmony of faith, for it ruined the divine value of the Cross and the Resurrection. In 381 the second ecumenical Council of Constantinople condemned Apollinaris.

Now, Antioch had a school of learning which was not exactly given to wild speculations. The powerful Jewish influence, to which the sermons of St. John Chrysostom testify, probably did much to make them cling to the literal interpretation of Holy Writ. In the same spirit they clung to dogmatic facts once these facts were settled by the Church. So when the Council of Constantinople decided that divine

revelation meant us to see in Christ a perfect divine nature and a perfect human nature, the savants of that school began to underline the perfect duality of these two natures. It was a time when the school was very brilliantly represented : Diodorus of Tarsus (d. before 394), Theodore of Mopsuestia (d. 428) and Theodoretus of Cyrus (d. c. 460) were worthy representatives of a worthy tradition. St. John Chrysostom kept closely in touch with them, especially with his intimate friend Theodore. In 427 the Patriarch of Constantinople, Sisinnius, had died and none of the candidates, however eager, succeeded in securing the succession for himself. Theodosius II (d. 450) solved the *impasse* by calling once more, as in the case of St. John Chrysostom, upon Antioch. His choice fell on Nestorius, a powerful theologian and a popular preacher.<sup>1</sup> Nestorius was keen, Stein even calls him fanatic, and in his keenness he was inclined to be narrow. He did not have the broad and understanding character of Chrysostom, but started by persecuting the remnants of the heretics in the imperial city. This involved him in heated discourses on the dogma which he meant to defend. His narrowness made him lose sight of the *analogia fidei*, the harmony of all the dogmas between themselves, and he almost naturally fell into such a heavy underlining of the completeness of the two natures that there was, for the casual hearer (and Constantinople was full of them : theological subjects were the usual topics to be discussed by men and women of society in the salons), hardly any room left for the one person of Christ in whom these two natures were substantially (better : subsistentially) united. This led to another conflict. His opponent, Cyril of Alexandria, was redoubtable. Cyril sought to force the issue. It is possible that there was a tendency on the part of the Patriarch of the South to establish his ascendancy over the patriarchate of Constantinople. It seems certain that not only did he, before the arrival of the papal legates and against the protest of the imperial commissioners, condemn Nestorius, but actually bribed the court with such huge sums that even the wealth of Alexandria could not provide them (1,500 pound of gold – 108,000 solidi were given to various influential men and women of the Emperor's *entourage*). Cyril won a decisive victory, when, after the arrival of the papal legates, Nestorius was finally condemned. The followers of Nestorius, now centred mainly in Edessa, whence the University of

<sup>1</sup> In all this I owe very much to Stein's work, mentioned above, who is very reliable for dates and material details.

Antioch had emigrated, hung on doggedly but quietly. In the meantime Cyril died in 444, two years after John of Antioch. John had been a friend of Nestorius and it was to him that Nestorius fled. But since the reconciliation between the fierce Cyril and John was vital to the maintenance of the results reached by the Council, Nestorius had to leave Antioch, where he had become popular as a preacher, and was hunted from one place to another. He may have met the truth in his opponents; he did not meet charity. The reconciliation between Antioch and Constantinople did not last long. Cyril, though fierce and perhaps not too tender in his methods, was, after all, a saint, not an easy saint to get on with, but there was very definitely a powerful and intensely lived religious conviction in his life. This is shown by his many works which must not be left aside in judging the man (as Stein seems to do because for him "theology" and "mysticism" do not appear to count as historical factors). It was exactly because Cyril fought at bottom for the truth, all the truth and the truth only, that he was constantly held within the boundaries of the harmony of faith and responsibility for his flock. After his death the situation changed. He was succeeded by Dioscorus. Although from the point of view of ecclesiastical politics the Council of Ephesus meant a victory of Alexandria over Constantinople the ultimate subordination of the imperial see to that of the South had not yet been achieved. Still using the weapon of doctrine for the use of their ambition the Alexandrines tried to maintain a powerful influence at the imperial court. Dioscorus sent a man there called Eutyches, a monk—monks had been too useful to Alexandrine politics to be abandoned. Eutyches had to watch over the orthodoxy of Flavianus, the then Patriarch of Constantinople. Ibas, bishop of Edessa, had been accused of Nestorianism. But Edessa was closely connected with Antioch, and the national feelings of the Syrians were as strong in Antioch as in Edessa. Dioscorus wrote a haughty letter to Domnus, the successor of John in the See of Antioch, laying down how to conduct himself with regard to Nestorianism. By this action Dioscorus united Orthodox and Nestorians in a common defence of their national dignity against the exorbitant claims of Alexandria. On 16th February 448 an imperial writ ordered the burning of all "Nestorian" books. But the Antioch scholars and bishops were not so easily defeated. Theodore of Cyrus made a clever move. Eutyches had in his anxiety to maintain the Alexandrine formulation of dogma (apparently slightly

more than the council had said) overstepped the prudent limits of Cyril. Theodoreetus denounced him to Flavianus of Apollinarism. With the good-humoured submission of Antioch to the formulas inspired by Cyril Theodoreetus stood a fair chance of succeeding in breaking Eutyches' influence. Both Eutyches and Flavianus appealed to Rome. Leo the Great (440–461) answered with his famous *Tomus*, a doctrinal writ to Flavianus. But Dioscorus did not submit. He tried to overrule Leo's decision, called the Council of Ephesus together on 8th August 449, forced the condemnation of Flavianus and his party, and actually maltreated them. Although the imperial power executed the various sentences of exile, they reckoned without the personality of Leo. Leo has often been blamed for exaggerated authoritarianism. If this were the case he would not have stood by Flavianus at the moment when both Church and Empire seemed to turn against him. He protested at once. After various negotiations the Council of Chalcedon met on 8th October 451. The whole procedure of the "robbers' synod" was duly exposed, and the various culprits condemned. And the result was the acceptance of Leo's *Tomus* for the final formula: two perfect natures united substantially in one Person in Christ. Even so, however, peace was not achieved. Leo's two perfect natures were misinterpreted by the Antiochians as a justification of Nestorius against the formula of Cyril to which they had with so much difficulty resigned themselves. That this interpretation is untrue is clear from the fact that at Chalcedon Cyril's writings were joined as official statements of the truth to Leo's *Tomus*, and that Nestorius was again condemned. A great party rejected the decision of the council. That is the origin of Jacobite Monophysitism.

*The Monophysitism of the Jacobites.* The first thing which seems to stand out is that the Jacobites reacted against the Council of Chalcedon. Now this council, as the preliminary "robbers' synod" shows—the name was given to Dioscorus' gathering at Ephesus by Leo the Great himself—was not an unalloyed peaceful theological discussion. There was a great deal of inter-patriarchal friction, and there was a great deal of international friction. The self-assertion of the Southern patriarchate of Alexandria and of the Eastern patriarchate of Antioch over against Constantinople, which was the manifestation of a widespread "loose-from-Byzantium" movement, played such an important rôle that without it the Monophysite movement cannot be understood. The tragedy was that this self-assertion was achieved by using

the sacred Christian faith instead of straightforward political means. The reason is probably that politically all power was so heavily concentrated in Byzantium that the spiritual weapon was almost the only one left—but this is no excuse. It is quite on the map that once the political problem will have received a final and satisfactory settlement, the possibilities of re-union of these separated brethren with the See of Leo the Great will be increased immeasurably.

In which sense are the Jacobites Monophysites?<sup>1</sup> I do not pretend to give my own opinion, but I may be allowed to quote Father Jugie's masterwork. According to him the great Monophysite theologians, amongst whom Severus of Antioch (512–538), Jacob of Sarug (d. 521) and the mysterious Pseudo-Denys the Areopagite taught in common with Orthodox and Catholic dogma :

1. that the Word made flesh is perfect God and perfect Man, consubstantial with the Father by His Godhead and consubstantial with His mother and ourselves by His manhood ;
2. that the Word of God remained completely unchanged in the Incarnation ; that He did not suffer in His Godhead, but in His humanity ;

3. that in the Incarnation there was no confusion or commixture or change of the Godhead in His humanity nor of His humanity in His Godhead.<sup>2</sup> And he concludes : “The greater and clearer part of the Monophysites who opposed the Council of Chalcedon did not defend Eutychianism, but a certain appearance of Monophysite doctrine which in reality can only be called ‘nominal’ or ‘verbal,’ since it is totally a matter of words and formulas, and differs from the orthodox teaching of the Incarnation only in appearance.”<sup>3</sup> It is true that Peter Fullo, Patriarch of Antioch, added in the Liturgy to the formula “Holy God, Holy Powerful One, Holy Immortal One” the words : “who was crucified for us.” For long centuries the Monophysites were accused, because of this addition, of applying these words to the Blessed Trinity, but modern research into the expressions of Monophysite theologians has proved that the whole formula is applied, as in the West on Good Friday, to Christ.<sup>4</sup> It is a pity that Fr. de Vries nowhere

<sup>1</sup> See M. Jugie, *Theologia Dogmatica Christianorum Orientalium ab ecclesia catholica dissidentium*, Paris, 1926 ; J. Lebon, *Le monophysisme Sévérien*, Louvain, 1909 ; F. Nau, *Dans quelle mesure les Jacobites sont-ils Monophysites ?* *Revue de L'Orient Chrétien*, 1905, all Catholic.

<sup>2</sup> Op. I., V, 422.

<sup>3</sup> Op. I., V, 412 f. ; see Nau, op. I., p. 113 ff., and F. Heiler, *Urkirche und Ostkirche*, 457–8.

<sup>4</sup> Heiler, op. I., 458–459.

in his work gives this statement, and does not seem to know the important work done on Severus of Antioch by Professor Lebon of Louvain. From all this it is clear why the Syrians prefer the name "Orthodox Syrians" or "Old Syrians" to that of "Monophysites."

*History and Organization of the Jacobites.* The Monophysites were severely persecuted by Byzantium. The Emperor Justinian (527-561) tried to stamp them out by confining all Monophysite bishops to monastic imprisonment. It was the worst he could do, for the monks had been the most powerful weapon in the pursuit of separatist movements in East and South. Jacob Baradai and Theodore of Bosra, two monks, obtained episcopal ordination from Theodosius of Alexandria, exiled for his Monophysite teaching. Jacob, who took over the direction of Syria, Mesopotamia and Asia Minor, ordained thousands of priests, 89 bishops and two patriarchs. At his death he made Sergius of Pella his successor, who, in his turn, was succeeded by the monk Paul of Beth Ukama. From him the succession runs on uninterruptedly till our present day. The Byzantine emperors did not allow these Patriarchs to reside in Antioch, but they had to live in various towns and monasteries. From 1034 they resided in Amida, from 1116 in Mardin and since 1484 in the monastery of Ananias in Dar-uz-Zafaran. They were favoured by the Moslem authorities because of their opposition to Byzantium and their greatest achievements were reached in the twelfth century when the Jacobite Patriarch ruled over 20 metropolitans, and 103 bishops. The centres were Jerusalem, Aleppo and Damascus. Of all the monasteries only some ten remain. From the fourteenth century onward their numbers shrunk constantly under Turkish oppression. At the end of the sixteenth century there were but 20 dioceses and to-day there are only eleven metropolitans, with several abbot-bishops without diocese. Some estimate the number of their faithful at about 80,000, others at 150,000—200,000, who are spread over Syria and Iraq, and speak different languages, Syriac, Arabic, Armenian and Kurd. The Jacobite Church distinguishes itself from other similar churches by its international character—which perhaps is the centuries old characteristic of the old Syrian merchant and soldier.

(*To be continued*).

DOM THEODORE WESSELING.

# NOTES ON SYRIAN MONOPHYSITE DOCTRINE

THE following notes are based on those West Syrian anaphoras which have been published or which have come to the writer's notice in the course of his reading. They do not pretend to give an exhaustive account of Syrian Monophysite doctrine on the two subjects dealt with.

The anaphoras consulted are given in Appendix II, and also their approximate dates where such have been investigated. Those marked with an asterisk in all probability were composed by the bishops to whom they are attributed. It should be noted in the case of an anaphora translated from the Greek that the whole of the extant Syriac text was not necessarily found in the original, interpolations and additions being not unusual.

Certain quotations from anaphoras, discussed below under various headings, for the sake of convenience have been thrown into Appendix I.

## I.—THE STATE OF THE DEPARTED.

1. *The General Judgment.*—Reference to this usually occurs in the Anamnesis. This in St. James's, the model of later anaphoras, reads :—

When thou comest to judge the living and the dead, when thou art about to reward every man according to his works.

This, its simplest form, is expanded in later anaphoras, often to an inordinate length.

Reference to 1 Thess. iv, 16, occurs in Severus, which prays that when Christ comes with his angels and in the glory of the Father to gather together his saints, we may not remain on earth, fixed there by our passions and weighed down by our sins, but that, when the elect are carried away in the clouds to meet him, we with them may sing hymns of victory. Similarly in Philoxenus II we read : " And may we be worthy to go forth upon light clouds to meet thee and with those, whom thou hast bidden, rejoice in thy spiritual bridal chamber and everlasting with gladness enjoy thy divine vision." The flight of the perfect " to the heavenly meeting place and to the nest of the kingdom " is definitely assigned in Clement II to the Last Day.

Note that the word rendered above by "bridal chamber" (thalamus) can also mean "marriage feast."

2. *Prayers for the Departed.*—St. James has:—

Give rest to their souls and bodies, delivering them from the endless damnation that is to be and accounting them worthy of bliss in the bosoms of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, where the light of thy countenance visiteth, whence pains and sorrows and sighs are fled away, not imputing to them their trespasses. Enter not into judgment with thy servants, for before thee shall be justified none that liveth.

Based on this model are the prayers in Timothy and Severus, asking for rest for the "souls, bodies and spirits" of the faithful departed in the bosoms of the three patriarchs. In lieu, however, of the words "where the light of thy countenance visiteth" the two anaphoras have "in the paradise of delights, in the place of rest," Timothy continuing: "where is the dwelling of all who rejoice," and Severus: "and in the tabernacles of the saints, where the multitude of those who keep festival shineth exceedingly, where is the consummation of life without sadness, the firstfruits of the unspeakable promises." A prayer for rest of "souls, spirits and bodies" in "the heavenly tabernacles and in the bosom of Abraham" is to be found in Peter of Callinicus.

In view of the mention of the departed bodies, "Abraham's bosom" in the above presumably refers to the state of final felicity after the Last Day. The allusion, of course, is to the parable of Dives and Lazarus, from which it may be inferred that the bosom of Abraham is also the abode of the blessed at the present time, and indeed prayers similar to those cited, but with no mention of bodies, are common. We shall see that the anaphoras in general teach that the saints are now in bliss. As to the state of others after death they say little or nothing, beyond the commonplace that their souls "have come" to God. The following prayers, however, are of interest.

(a) Gregory Nazianzen.—Neither against us who live nor against those who by (their) decease have departed and are escaped from this world may thy kindness remember those things evilly done by us. But deliver us, Lord, from the clutches of the wicked ones who are in the air, who lie in wait to catch our souls at the straits which are there.

(b) Basil I.—Give them rest in thy bridal chamber full of pleasures, carry them over (or, through) the straits of the region of terror, place them in tabernacles of light, deliver them from darkness and gloom and preserve them from sorrow and anguish, and may thy countenance appear to them serene,

and enter not with them into judgment and a strict searching into their deeds.

(c) Dionysius the Areopagite I.—And that thou mayest preserve us from the wrath kept for the wicked and the punishments of the workers of iniquity and from the cruel attack of the demons, who assail our souls when we shall go forth hence, and make us worthy of thy kingdom and the dwelling places of those who have kept thy commandments.

(d) Dionysius the Areopagite II.—Account us worthy of a blessed end and a peaceful departure from this world, and restrain from us the evil host of the robbers of sin (i.e. the demons), who hover in the air to catch the souls of men, and make us ready on the Last Day with confidence to meet thy beloved Son at his revelation from heaven.

(e) Lazarus bar Sabbathæ.—Deliver and preserve them in thy mercy from the burning of the evildoers and the wicked, carry them over (or, through) the frightful straits and the narrow places of the region of terror and free them from the clutches of the evil and adverse spirits, draw them up in thy mercy out of the whirlpool of perdition and of the second death.

From the Anamnesis of Eustathius it is clear that “the region of terror” is hell. Dom R. H. Connolly, O.S.B., to whom I am indebted for help in dealing with these texts, suggests that the “straits” and “narrow places” “are not in hell itself, but only obstacles on the road, which if not negotiated, will land the soul in hell.” The passage of these, conceived of as being made through the air, clearly is connected with the assault by demons, but the time when it is supposed to take place is somewhat obscure. Dionysius the Areopagite I and II seem to place it immediately or shortly after death; a prayer, however, in the Breviary office for the Friday of the Departed, “Save them from the frightful straits by the great sign of thy Cross” (Penqitha, Mossul edition, 1889, vol. III, p. 188) apparently refers it to the Last Day. The word rendered by “straits” can also mean “(mountain) passes,” but the mention of the whirlpool in Lazarus suggests that the metaphor is from navigation rather than from journeying by land.

To the above quotations may be added one from John of Harran :—

(f) Our fathers and our brethren and our masters and all our faithful departed do thou remember, Lord. And make them not subject to the powers of darkness and deliver them from the clutches of the evil spirits, and cause the light of thine only-begotten Son to rise upon us and upon them.

The demons in the air, lying in wait for souls, are also mentioned in Michael and in John the Scribe. It may be noted that in Peter I and Peter of Callinicus, the devil is called "the king of the air," the reference possibly being to Ephesians vi, 12.

Two passages definitely refer to the time of death. Marutha of Taghrith has :—

Lead us to an end befitting those who do good and, when according to the will of thy Godhead our frame shall be dissolved and we shall change the present life, account us worthy of a peace-bearing angel, and deliver us from Tartarus the dark, and make us ready, uncondemned and with shining lamps, to meet thine only-begotten Son.

Similarly Ignatius bar Wahib prays for an "angel of tranquillity and peace." With these may be compared the Ordo Commendationis Animae of the Rituale Romanum.

*3. The State of the Just before the Resurrection and General Judgment.*—The anaphoras generally agree that the righteous are now in bliss.

The place where they are, sometimes, as for example in Severus (Appendix I), is spoken of as heaven. Similarly in the Preface of Cyril of Jerusalem "earth," that is the terrestrial Church, is opposed to "heaven" or the Church in which are written the firstborn, where God is praised by the angels, archangels, etc., the assemblies of the perfect, the festal and exulting gatherings of the saints, the cherubim and seraphim (cfr. Hebr. xii, 22, 23). According to St. James and Timothy the saints now stand before God's judgment seat (see sections 4 and 5 below) and according to Athanasius before the throne of the divine majesty.

The general position, however, taken up in the anaphoras is that the righteous await in bliss the coming of the heavenly Bridegroom, though in the company of the angels. God's throne, therefore, may have been conceived of as veiled.

According to Severus, Athanasius, James Baradaeus and Dionysius the Areopagite II the saints are not yet crowned (Appendix II). But in Julius we find : "Those, who, in holiness ( $\delta\sigmaιws$ ) having been crowned, both have come to thee with confidence and are made intercessors and suppliants unto thee for us," and in Lazarus, the holy doctors are said to "have received crowns of victory," while in the Epiclesis of John Evangelist the Holy Ghost is he "who spake in the prophets and crowned the apostles and martyrs." In none of these cases, however, is it probable that the crowning refers to final bliss.

4. *The Saints offer the Sacrifice with the Living.*—This doctrine is clearly set forth in St. James :—

For this reason we also are mindful of them, in order that they standing before thy lofty judgment seat ( $\beta\hat{\eta}\mu\alpha$ ) may be mindful of our wretchedness and poverty and offer unto thee with us this fearful and unbloody sacrifice, on the one hand for the safety of the living and the encouragement of us, wretched and unworthy, on the other for the rest and remembrance of all who have aforetime fallen asleep in the belief of the truth.

The same teaching is found in Severus and in Dionysius the Areopagite II.

Germane to the subject of the relation of the saints to the Eucharist is the prayer in Gregory Nazianzen “that we may be accounted worthy of dwelling among their assemblies and companies . . . and there delight, unsated, in this mystical and lifegiving sacrifice.”

5. *The Saints and our prayers.*—That the saints are in no need of the prayers of the living, who are unworthy to offer for their beatitude, is set forth in Timothy and Severus. The first of these two anaphoras has : “Not that we, Lord, are worthy to offer unto thee for their own blessedness, but that they standing before the judgment seat ( $\beta\hat{\eta}\mu\alpha$ ) of thine Only-begotten may pray for our wretchedness and poverty.” For this see also the Greek St. James (Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, p. 57). Cfr. Athanasius in Appendix I.

6. *The Parable of the Wheat and the Cockle.*—A curious reference to this parable occurs in James of Serugh II :—

Maker of angels and men, who by thy might wilt dissolve the world and also gather souls into barns to be kept until the last days, when thou wilt send thy Spirit and they shall be made and thou wilt renew the face of the earth, when thou wilt also fashion anew (their) image and take away from them things corruptible and place them in glory, and wilt dissolve (their) structure of clay and clothe them with endless glory. . . .

Here the “barns” must be identified with Abraham’s bosom as in Clement I and II (Appendix I). But at the end of the Intercession in Clement I we read :—

And grant us, when the righteous will be gathered together into the barns of joy and the wicked will be burnt like chaff, that in the assemblies of thy saints we may glorify thee and sing : Blessed is he that cometh. . . .

In this passage the “barns” clearly refer to the state of final beatitude.

## II. THE PROCESSION OF THE HOLY GHOST.

The following passages occur in the Epiclesis of the following anaphoras :—

Marutha of Taghrith.—Who proceedeth from thee and receiveth from thy Son.

Peter of Callinicus.—Who proceedeth from thee continually and receiveth from thy Son ceaselessly and without change.

Clement I.—Who proceedeth from thee without beginning through thine only-begotten Son.

Matthew the Shepherd.—Who perpetually proceedeth from thee and receiveth from thy Son those things which are his in essence (*οὐσία*).

Xystus.—Who from thee, God the Father, proceedeth eternally and from the Son himself receiveth essentially (=*οὐσιωδῶς*).

Dionysius bar Salibi.—Who proceedeth from the Father and receiveth from the Son.

## APPENDIX I.

1. Gregory Nazianzen.—Remember, Lord, upon thine holy and heavenly altar and in thy bridal chamber, spiritual and full of light, the souls and spirits of all who by the dissolution of the body have gone forth from this world, thy priests and stewards and thy deacons. . . . And giving rest to those who have passed out of this world, account us also worthy to delight there with them and see the exultations of the angels and the spiritual dances of the assemblies of the saints and be filled with the unspeakable joys which from the beginning have been promised to the blessed by thee, they and we having hopeful expectation of the designer (*ὑπογραφεύς*) of our members and the renewer of our bodies, thy Son our Lord Jesus Christ (i.e. at the Resurrection).

2. Basil I.—Although thou hast taken up to places, glorious and immaterial and beyond comparison, the company of thy saints, O Lord, render us united to them in the Church of the firstborn, O good one.

Basil II reads: Although thou hast taken up to the unchangeable firstfruits (*variant* places) of glory beyond comparison. . . .

3. Severus.—For although, since they have attained to heavenly dwelling places and have been held worthy to receive high honours (at that hour when the crowns are distributed after the measure of the works of each in the light of the saints), they need not oblations for themselves. . . .

This is from the Coptic version; the Syriac omits the words in brackets.

4. Athanasius.—Not because it is in need of glorification from us do we commemorate over thy sacrifice the company of thy saints, the holy apostles and prophets and martyrs and the rest of the firstborn who are written in thy book of life, but because of the help to us from their prayers, in order that, having their protection together as they stand before the throne of thy majesty awaiting the bestowal of compensation (which will be fulfilled exceedingly by the distribution of crowns), we may be accounted worthy to minister unto thee without accusation and stand before thine holy altar.

5. Clement I.—(i) Remember, O Lord, those who in every region and city have been pleasing to thee and with a spotless departure have gone forth from this world and have been lifted up unto thee into the mansions of light, the first fathers and chiefs of the tribes, seers of mysteries and interpreters of revelations . . . (i.e. the saints).

(ii) To all those who have run the race of life . . . give rest, Lord, in the spiritual bosoms of joy, in the mansions of light and exultation, in the tabernacles of delights and rest, in the barns of bliss far away from all sadness, where the souls of the just await the firstfruits of life without toil and the spirits of the righteous look for the expected reward of the promises, in that region where those tired with toil and the weary look for the heavenly paradise and the children of the bridal chamber (i.e. those invited to the marriage) long for the heavenly Bridegroom, where those bidden to the feast expect to enter and earnestly desire to receive the new robe of glory, where is no sadness and joy is found.

6. Clement II.—(i) Those who with a spotless departure have gone forth from this world, seers of mysteries and interpreters of revelations, instructors of the holy Church and teachers of the true faith, those who desired to see Thy day and saw it and were glad, and caught in the net of their teaching the whole earth unto the knowledge of the truth, and in place of temporal gifts and boons which last not have been enriched with pleasures that last and joys that fail not and, with the children of light, the eternal glory together with the whole fullness of blessing, which thou hast heaped up in the blessed mansions of those who have accomplished thy will.

(ii) May their souls (i.e. the departed) delight in the tabernacles of waiting, in the barns of joy, in those spiritual and restful bosoms, where the spirits of the just receive the firstfruits of eternal life, in the region where the tired and weary are held worthy of reward.

## APPENDIX II.

## ANAPHORAS.

Name.	Date, etc.	Earliest MS.
Athanasius	Part at least from Greek ; VII cent.	XIII cent.
Basil I	{ From Greek. Translated <i>circa</i> 616. Two variants.	XIII cent.
Basil II		XVIII cent.
Clement I	{ VIII—IX cent. Primitive form of both ?	XIII cent.
Clement II	{ VII—VIII cent.	X cent.
Cyril of Jerusalem	From Greek. VI—VII cent.	X cent.
*Dionysius bar Salibi	Metropolitan of Amid, ob. 1171.	1230.
Dionysius the Areopagite I Do. do. II	Fairly early.	X—XI cent.
Eustathius	—	1137
Gregory Nazianzen	From Greek. VI—VII cent.	IX—X cent.
*Ignatius bar Wahib	Patriarch of Antioch, ob. 1300.	XIV—XV cent.
St. James	From Greek. Syriac version revised by James of Edessa, ob. 708.	VIII—IX cent.
James Baradaeus	Ob. 578. Probably VIII or even IX cent.	XIV—XV cent.
James of Serugh II	Ob. 521. Before 1219—20 and probably considerably earlier.	XIII cent.
John Evangelist	—	1182
*John of Harran	Ob. 1165.	XV cent.
*John the Scribe	Patriarch of Antioch, ob. 1219—20.	1484
Julius of Rome	—	X cent.
*Lazarus bar Sabbathai	Bishop of Baghdad, <i>vixit</i> 829.	1182
*Marutha	Metropolitan of Taghrith on the Tigris between Mossul and Baghdad, ob. 649.	XV cent.
*Matthew the Shepherd	Bishop of Hassasa near Taghrith, date unknown.	XIII—XIV cent.
*Michael the Elder	Patriarch of Antioch, ob. 1199.	XII cent.

APPENDIX II (*continued*)

Name.	Date, etc.	Earliest MS.
Peter the Apostle I	—	XIII cent.
Peter of Callinicus	Patriarch of Antioch, ob. 591. Possibly of later date. Connected with last.	XV cent.
Philoxenus II	Bishop of Mabbogh, 485— 519. Perhaps VIII—IX cent.	1182
Severus of Antioch	Ob. 538. From Greek, VII cent. Also in Coptic.	XIII cent.
*Timothy of Alexandria	From Greek. VI cent.	IX-X cent.
Xystus of Rome	—	XIII cent.

Anaphoras of the same name are distinguished from one another by numerals. For the meaning of the asterisk, see the second paragraph of this paper.

H. W. CODRINGTON.

## BENEDICTINE CONTACTS, ANCIENT AND MODERN, WITH THE EASTERN CHURCHES

THE late Pope Pius XI, in a letter dated the feast of St. Benedict, March 21st, 1924, requesting from the Benedictines prayers and works on behalf of Russia, wrote as follows : " In this work of bringing about union (with the dissident Russians), who could there be of greater service to Us than the ever diligent monks of the West, who have always been held in such repute for their work in Christian and civil affairs ? For, indeed, the monastic institute had its origin in the East, and already before that most lamentable schism it was flourishing in a most wonderful way, owing chiefly to the leadership of St. Benedict whom the Orientals themselves honour as patriarch of the Western monks. To this day that institute has remained loyal to its traditional laws, and it still faithfully cultivates a special love for the sacred liturgy and retains its ancient constitutional form. All these factors cannot but pave the way and lighten the task of the Benedictine monks in their apostolate for the

reconciliation of their dissident brethren.”<sup>1</sup> For similar reasons Pope Leo XIII in 1897 entrusted to the care of the Benedictines the Greek College of St. Athanasius in Rome and in 1899 that of the Syrian seminary at Jerusalem.<sup>2</sup> Many Benedictines still remember the insistence with which Leo XIII was wont to remind them of his “pet subject,” viz., that he thought the Benedictine monks “a sort of natural link between the Eastern and the Western churches.”

In fact, it is interesting to find Benedictine monks of all centuries turning instinctively to the East as to their ancestral home, studying the liturgy, literature and monastic lore of the Eastern churches, eager to bring about happier relations between Western and Eastern ecclesiastical centres, sending monastic colonies to the East and receiving and entertaining in their Western cloisters their Eastern brethren. Benedictine history supplies numerous examples of all these activities. Only the most salient are collected in the following pages: each, however, could easily be developed into a monograph or even a large book.

\* \* \*

The first contact between Eastern and Benedictine monachism is established in the Holy Rule itself. No Benedictine monk could forget the words of the last chapter of the Holy Rule: “Moreover, what else are the Collations of the Fathers, their Institutes, their Lives, also the Rule of Our Holy Father Basil, but examples of good living and obedience of monks, and so many instruments of virtue?”

St. Gregory the Great, the outstanding propagator of the Benedictine institute in the West, seems to have been the first to make it known also in the East. Shortly after his profession as a Benedictine, he was appointed apocrisarius at Constantinople, and, he writes in his preface to the *Moralia*, “many of the brethren of my monastery, moved by fraternal love towards

<sup>1</sup> “In hoc autem unitatis restaurandae negotio, ecquis Nobis impensiorem operam navare possit quam sollertissimi monachi occidentis, qui semper de re christiana civilique tam bene meruerunt? Etenim ab oriente monasticum institutum suam duxit originem, idemque, ante luctuosum illud discidium—duce quidem imprimis Sancto Benedicto, qui ab orientalibus ipsis tamquam patriarcha monachorum occidentalium colitur—mirandum floruit in modum: immo etiam nunc tradita a patribus praecepta, sacrae liturgiae studium, praecipuasque antiquissimae institutionis formas fideliter retinet: quae quidem omnia expeditiorem viam ad apostolatum et reconciliationem fratrum dissidentium monachis benedictinis certe munient.” *Annales O.S. Benedicti*, Sublaci, 1920-26, pp. 74-75.

<sup>2</sup> *Ann. O.S. Benedicti*, 1893-1908, pp. 10 and 13 respectively.

me, followed me to the palace,"<sup>1</sup> with the result that, as he goes on to say, he could continue to alternate the life of the monk with the life of an ecclesiastical diplomat. Among those who were with him at the palace were the monk archbishop of Seville, St. Leander, to whom the words quoted above were addressed,<sup>2</sup> and St. Maximianus, a Sicilian, who became a monk and abbot of St. Andrew's at Rome and died archbishop of Syracuse (d. 591).<sup>3</sup> When Gregory became pope he did not forget his monastic brethren of the East: witness his benefactions to the monks of Mount Sinai.<sup>4</sup>

A good example of the happy relations between Eastern and Western monks during the seventh century is afforded by St. Theodore of Tarsus, archbishop of Canterbury, an Eastern monk who settled at Rome, and evidently—at any rate when he became archbishop-abbot of Christ Church—simply followed the Western observance.

Up to Charlemagne's time, however, no permanent Benedictine foundation existed in the East.<sup>5</sup> The great Emperor, as is well-known, maintained the friendliest relations with the Kaliph of Jerusalem, Harun al-Raschid, who c. 799 allowed a community of Western monks to establish themselves on the Mount of Olives. The abbey was known as St. Mary the Latin (*Sancta Maria Latina*) and its monks directed a hospital attached to it. In 870 it was visited by a French Benedictine, named Bernard, in company with a Spanish monk. Bernard describes the abbey as enriched with "a most noble library, a hospital, twelve dependent houses, fields, vineyards and a garden in the valley of Josaphat."<sup>6</sup> The community continued to exist, with many ups and downs, until the time of the Crusades, when the hospital attached to

<sup>1</sup> Cum in terreno palatio libentius excubarem, me multi ex monasterio fratres mei, germana vinci charitate, sequiti sunt. . . . See *P.L.*, T. 75, col. 267.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.*, col. id.

<sup>3</sup> *Ib.*, col. 353.

<sup>4</sup> . . . adeo ut etiam in Monte Sinai Dei famulis constitutis quaeque erant opportuna transmitteret. Paul. Diac., *Vita Greg.*, *P.L.* T. 75, col. 43.

<sup>5</sup> The most exhaustive monograph on the Eastern Benedictine foundations up to date is that of Dom B. Gariador, O.S.B., *Les Anciens Monastères Bénédictins en Orient*, Lille-Paris, 1912. Dom Gariador was the first prior of Abu-Gosch, near Jerusalem, and afterwards abbot general of the Congregation of Subiaco. He died in the East (1937) in the course of a canonical visitation, entrusted to him by the Holy See, to the Basilian-Melkite monks of Mount Lebanon and other Eastern monastic groups. See also Dom U. Berlière, O.S.B., *Les Anciens Monastères Bénédictins de Terre-Sainte*, in *Rev. Bénéd.*, 1888, pp. 437-446, 502-512, 546-562.

<sup>6</sup> ". . . nobilissimam habens bibliothecam . . . et hospitale . . ." See Mabillon, *Acta SS.O.S. Bened.*, saec. III, p. II, n. 10.

it developed into the military Order of the Hospitallers of St. John, now known as the Knights of Malta.<sup>1</sup>

It was also during this period that another Benedictine, the Englishman St. Willibald (d. in 786 as bishop of Eichstatt), travelled to the Holy Land (721–727), via Samos, Cyprus and Damascus, visiting the most important Eastern *lauras* and staying for two years (727–729) at Constantinople, before he returned to Italy and from 729 to 739 helped to revive the Benedictine life at Monte Cassino under St. Petronax.

\* \* \*

The tenth and eleventh centuries mark the epoch of the closest relations between Eastern and Western monks and of their greatest mutual influence. Owing to the ever-recurring persecutions and depredations of the Eastern communities by the Saracens, many of their members come westward, either to establish themselves permanently in Western countries or to beg alms for their pauperized *lauras*. They thus exert a considerable influence on Western, chiefly Italian, Benedictinism, then emerging from the chaotic conditions of the ninth century. On the other hand pilgrimages of the Westerners, many of them abbots and monks, to Palestine become a sort of ascetical fashion, which gradually spreads until it ultimately issues in the flood-tide of the Crusades. This movement, particularly as regards the presence of Eastern monks in the West, has not yet been systematically studied. It abounds in illuminating and often startling facts.

One of these, which had a wide influence on the Italian monastic life of the tenth century, was the foundation of the abbey of SS. Boniface and Alexius on the Aventine Hill, Rome, in the year 977.<sup>2</sup> The founder was Bl. Sergius, archbishop of Damascus, a whilom monk of Syria, who had to flee to Rome when his city was captured by the Saracens. With Pope Benedict VII's help, he built an abbey on the Aventine, under the title of St. Boniface (Latin titular) and St. Alexius (Greek titular), where the Greek monks who had succeeded in escaping from the East continued to live under St. Basil's Rule side by side with their Latin brethren, who observed that of St. Benedict.<sup>3</sup> Bl. Sergius himself seems to have remained a "Basilian" in observance up to his death in 981. The abbey became a nursery of Benedictine apostles,

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Dom Berlière, *loc. cit.*, p. 546.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. L. Zambarelli, *SS. Bonifacio ed Alessio all'Aventino*, Rome, 1924.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. A. Zimmermann, O.S.B., *Kalendarium Benedictinum, Die Heiligen und Seligen des Benediktinersordens uns seiner Zweige*, III, p. 289, Metten, 1937.

who set out from it to evangelize the Slavs in the region lying between what are now Eastern Prussia and Western Russia : the two best-known are the Czech brothers, St. Adalbert of Prague (d. 997) and St. Gaudentius of Gnesen (d. 1004). Through St. Adalbert of Prague, his friend the Camaldolesian St. Bruno-Boniface of Querfurt (d. 1009) planned and undertook the evangelization of Poland, the Balkans and Western Russia, the first monk-martyrs of Poland—SS. Benedict, Matthew, John, Isaac and Christianus (d. 1005)—being his fellow-apostles.<sup>1</sup> The fire of apostolic zeal enkindled the soul of St. Romuald himself, who repeatedly set out for the Slav mission-field, but failed to arrive there. One of his immediate disciples, St. Bononius (d. 1026), monk of St. Stephen's at Bologna, preached in Syria and Egypt before becoming abbot of Locedio in Piedmont.

Another Eastern monk who had a decidedly beneficial influence on Italian Benedictinism was St. Nilus the Younger (d. 1004). Abbot of a Byzantine monastery in Calabria, he and his community were driven out by the Saracens (*c.* 981) and for fifteen years were hospitably housed at Velluccio on an estate which belonged to Monte Cassino. St. Nilus, we are told, loved to visit the archabbey : certain it is that the beginnings of the era of greatest splendour in the history of the Benedictine *archicoenobium* synchronize with St. Nilus's visits.<sup>2</sup> Indeed, for several centuries the Greek influence was strongly felt in the Sacred Mountain. "From the ninth to the eleventh centuries," writes Dom Lacissotti, "the Divine Office was recited in choir both in Latin and in Greek and many traces of Greek influence can be found in the Cassinese liturgy of that period."<sup>3</sup> Even among the Cassinese saints of that time we find several of Greek descent, e.g., St. Nicius (d. *c.* 1000), monk of the Cassinese cell of Foresta, near Pontecorvo in Terra di Lavoro.<sup>4</sup>

Other examples of Eastern monks who came west and died Benedictines could be cited. St. Simeon (d. 1016), an Armenian, after leading the life of a solitary in the East, went on a pilgrimage-tour (Jerusalem, Rome, Compostella, Tours,

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Mgr. F. G. Holweck, *A Biographical Dictionary of the Saints*, St. Louis, Minn., 1924, p. 146.

<sup>2</sup> St. Nilus's community settled finally, and still flourishes, at Grottaferrata on the Alban Hills, overlooking Rome. Affection for the Benedictines is traditional in the community. The present writer still remembers going there in his youth with a party of Benedictine students from the Aventine ; we were received much as if we had been visiting one of our Benedictine houses.

<sup>3</sup> In *L'Italia Benedettina, Montecassino*, p. 18. Rome, 1929.

<sup>4</sup> Holweck, *op. cit.*, p. 439.

etc.), and ultimately settled at the Cluniac abbey of Padolirone, near Mantua, where he passed the rest of his life. Another St. Simeon (d. 1035), a native of Syracuse, educated at Constantinople and a hermit near the Jordan, eventually joined a community at Bethlehem, whence he migrated to Mount Sinai. The abbot of this place sent him on a questing mission to the Duke of Normandy. The saint never went back to the East, but asked instead to be walled up near the Benedictine abbey of St. Martin's, at Trèves, and there he lived till his death under the obedience of the abbot. These examples of Eastern monastic ascesis could not but exert a powerful influence on the contemporary Benedictine revivals throughout the West.

The same tenth and eleventh centuries saw the monks of the West travelling Eastward in ever increasing numbers as pilgrims to the Holy Land. Some of them remained permanently in the East. We read of an abbot of Monte Cassino, John by name,<sup>1</sup> who went to visit Jerusalem and remained there; later, he lived for six years as a hermit on Mount Sinai, and finally migrated to Mount Athos—the ἄγιον ὄπος (Holy Mountain) of Greek monasticism.<sup>2</sup>

Then, there is the curious case of (St.) Antony the Roman (1067–1147). Born in Rome, he became a Benedictine and then a hermit on a rock on the shore of the Adriatic. Eventually he set out for Novgorod in Russia, where he became an abbot (*begumen*). Ever since his death he has been venerated by the Russians as a saint. It seems that he remained loyal to his Roman allegiance.<sup>3</sup>

In many cases the monastic *Drang nach Osten* resulted in definitive Benedictine foundations in the East. Thus, towards the end of the eleventh century, some monks of Cava in Southern Italy, dispatched by their great abbot St. Peter I Pappacarbone (d. 1123), entered the very stronghold of Eastern monachism and were allowed to open a house of their own in the monastic republic of Mount Athos.<sup>4</sup> The same abbey, and under the same abbot,<sup>5</sup> restored St. Mary the Latin at Jerusalem. Indeed,<sup>6</sup> shortly after the first triumphs of the Crusaders, the

<sup>1</sup> Probably John II, 996–997. See *L'Italia Benedettina*, p. 64.

<sup>2</sup> Domum vero Hierosolymam profectus, per sex continuos annos in Monte Sinai vitam eremiticam duxit. Postmodum vero in Graecia, in monte cui ἄγιον ὄπος dicitur, aliquanto est tempore conversatus. Pet. Diac. *De Ortu et Obitu Just. Cass.*, P.L., T. 173, col. 1102.

<sup>3</sup> Russian Biographical Dictionary, Vol. II, p. 213. From a biographical note kindly communicated by G. Bennigsen.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. O. Rousseau, *L'Ancien monastère bénédictin du Mont Athos*, in *Rev. Lit. et Mon.*, 1929, pp. 530–547: also Dom P. de Meester, O.S.B., *Voyage de deux Bénédictins aux Monastères du Mont Athos*, Paris, 1908, pp. 63 sqq.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. *L'Italia Benedettina*, Cava, pp. 176 sqq.

<sup>6</sup> See Dom Berlière, *loc. cit.*, p. 546.

Benedictines, mostly Cluniacs, possessed nine abbeys and five priories in the patriarchate of Jerusalem and nine abbeys and two priories in that of Antioch. Moreover, they had a score or so of monasteries at, or near, Constantinople and sundry communities in Cyprus and in Rhodes.<sup>1</sup> Thus, on almost every sacred spot of Palestine, and elsewhere throughout the East, the Benedictine life was observed by large communities who, in almost every case, directed also hospitals and schools.

Accompanying the Crusaders there arrived in Palestine several monks of exceptional holiness of life. Some of them, we know, were martyred there at the hands of the Mohammedans, e.g., St. Thiemo, a monk of Niederaltaich in Bavaria, who became abbot of St. Peter's, Salzburg, and then archbishop of the same city, martyred at Corozaim in 1102 for refusing to apostatize to Islam; and Bl. Ernest, abbot of Zwiefalten, tortured to death at Mecca in 1148.<sup>2</sup> The communities residing in Palestine were often exposed to persecution and death at the hands of the Saracens: in 1113 the whole Cluniac community of Mount Tabor was massacred.<sup>3</sup> All the Palestinian houses ceased to exist in 1187.

Their example, however, could not but have proved in many ways an object-lesson to the Eastern monks and to the Easterners in general. We read that St. Nerses Lambronazi (d. 1198), the Armenian archbishop of Tarsus who promoted the reunion of Little Armenia with the Holy See, was greatly struck with the lives of the Cluniac monks of St. Paul's at Antioch, and that he translated into Armenian the Rule of St. Benedict and the customary of that abbey.<sup>4</sup> The Eastern rulers, too, both ecclesiastic and civil, invoked the Benedictines as mediators in their dealings with the Crusaders, who often went too far in penalizing the Christian populations of the East. Thus the Byzantine Emperor Alexius I Comnenus repeatedly wrote<sup>5</sup> to Bl. Oderisius (d. 1105), abbot of Montecassino, for that purpose. Indeed, the

<sup>1</sup> Dom Gariador, *op. cit.*, *passim*.

<sup>2</sup> Dom Berlière, *loc. cit.*, p. 500, note; Holweck, *op. cit.*, pp. 329 and 974.

<sup>3</sup> They are listed as *Beati* in several martyrologies: Bucelin, Saussaye, Menard; the Bollandists catalogue them among the *Praetermissi*.

<sup>4</sup> Dom Berlière, *loc. cit.*, p. 560; Butler-Thurston-Attwater, July, p. 239.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Leo Mars., *Chronicon Cass.*: Alexius Imperator Constantinopolitanus per Joannem choropalasium suum transmisit Beato Benedicto vestem de dorso suo oxodeauratam . . . Pari etiam modo Oderisius litteras Goffrido regi Jerosolymitano ac Boamundo principi Antiocheno, ne Imperatorem debellarent, transmittere studuit . . . " P.L., T. 173, col. 844. The relations between Constantinople and Montecassino had been most happy since the time of abbot St. Desiderius (Pope Victor III), who had imported from that city artists of all kinds to decorate the new basilica of the archabbey. Cf. *loc. cit.*, col. 748, sqq.

Cassinese Chronicle informs us that the Greek emperor preferred the Latin abbeys to all others.<sup>1</sup>

\* \* \*

The lamentable schism between East and West has nowhere been more deeply deplored than in the Benedictine cloisters, where at every period we find men of outstanding ability earnestly striving for a rapprochement. The efforts of two Benedictine monks, Bl. Urban II and St. Anselm of Canterbury, at the Council of Bari (1097), are well known : they succeeded at any rate in keeping the Italo-Greek bishops from going into schism.<sup>2</sup>

A great Benedictine who worked heart and soul for reunion was the general of the Camaldoleses, Bl. Ambrose Traversari (d. 1439). Born near Florence in 1376, Ambrose became a pupil of the Greek humanist Chrysoloras at Venice ; at the age of twenty-four he joined the Camaldoleses Benedictines at the abbey *degli Angeli* at Florence, where he continued his classical studies. Throughout his life he worked for the reunion of the Greeks with the Holy See. He and his friend Cardinal Bassarion were protagonists in the Council of Florence ; indeed, the canons and decree of reunion issued at that council, in Greek and in Latin, were their work.

A century later, the Vallombrosan Benedictine, Bl. Angelo Leonora (d. 1530), died as a recluse at Le Celle, near Vallombrosa, without having witnessed "the one great hope" of his life, namely, the reconciliation of the East with the West. Bl. Angelo was a Roman born and had started on his ecclesiastical career as auditor of the Sacred Roman Rota. He had then become (1488) a monk of Santa Prassede in Rome and abbot of Corvara. In his hermitage at Le Celle, whither he had retired, he spent his days praying for reunion ; he had already composed the liturgical office for that event : *Festum Unionis et Nuptiarum Agni*.<sup>3</sup>

There is another great Benedictine whose work for the reunion of the churches has not yet received the recognition it deserves : we refer to Cardinal Angelo M. Quirini (1688—1755),<sup>4</sup> a Benedictine of the Cassinese Congregation. Born at

<sup>1</sup> . . . Super omnia Latini nominis monasteria dilexerat. . . *Loc. cit.*, col. 885.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Donald Attwater, *A Dictionary of the Popes*, London, 1939, p. 165.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Zimmermann, *op. cit.*, III, p. 475.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *Catalogo delle Opere dell'Emmo. e Rmo. Signore Card. Quirini. . . Brescia, 1751*.—So far the most up-to-date monograph on Card. Quirini is that of Card. Baudrillart : *De Cardinalis Quirini vita et operibus . . . Paris, 1889*, pp. 132 in 8 : it is based on Breithaupt's, *Geschichte des Card. Quirini*, Frankfurt, 1752 and on Armellini's bio-biographical notes in the *Bibliotheca Cassinensis*.

Venice and educated by the Jesuits at Brescia, he joined the Benedictines at Florence (1696) and gave himself up with great enthusiasm to the study of the Eastern languages, chiefly Greek, entering into literary relations with the best scholars of his time, notably with Montfaucon. From 1710 to 1714 he travelled in order to meet men of letters, visiting Germany, the Low Countries, England,<sup>1</sup> and France. In 1719 he was appointed by Pope Clement XI a member of the special Congregation created for the reform of the Greek liturgical books. Quirini edited the Greek Office for Lent (1721) and followed it with a series of scholarly treatises on the Greek liturgy and other Eastern studies. In 1723 he was appointed bishop of Corfu, where the people, both Catholic and Orthodox, flocked to hear him preach in Greek in the cathedral. Unfortunately he was not allowed to stay there long : in 1727 he was transferred to Brescia and three years later created cardinal and appointed librarian of the Holy See. He never ceased to take a keen interest in everything connected with the Eastern churches and he promoted Assemani's edition of St. Ephrem's works (1732—1746).

\* \* \*

Since the seventeenth century there have been even more direct Benedictine contacts with the Eastern churches. In 1711 the Ven. Mekhitar founded at Venice the Armenian Benedictines.<sup>2</sup> In 1861 a Georgian priest, Peter Chiarischianti, established for his compatriots at Constantinople the Congregation of the Immaculate Conception under the Benedictine Rule and normally following the Byzantine rite.<sup>3</sup> As already stated, Leo XIII in 1897 by his *motu proprio*, *Sodalium Benedictinorum*, entrusted the direction of the central Greek College of St. Athanasius in Rome to the Abbot Primate of the Benedictines with the title of Procurator Apostolic.<sup>4</sup> The Benedictine Fathers who conduct the College (at present all members of the Belgian Congregation), as well of course as the students themselves, carry out all liturgical functions according to the Byzantine rite. The same pope, in 1899, desired the French Benedictines of La-Pierre-qui-vire to make

<sup>1</sup> He visited Oxford, where his great friend, John Hudson, prefect of the Bodleian, wanted to make him a doctor of the University. At Oxford he was dissuaded from visiting "the much inferior university of Cambridge"!

<sup>2</sup> See my article, *The Armenian Mekhitarist Benedictines*, in *The Eastern Churches Quarterly*, April, 1940, pp. 59-64.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. R. Janin, *Les Eglises Orientales et les Rites Orientaux*, 3rd ed., Paris, 1926, pp. 368-69.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *Statistica con cenni storici della Gerarchia e dei fedeli di Rito Orientale*. Sacra Congregazione Orientale. Vaticano, 1932, pp. 270-273.

a foundation at Abu-Gosch, near Jerusalem, and in 1902, at the request of the Syrian patriarch, Mar Ephrem II Rahmani, the Syrian seminary was entrusted to them and a new house opened for it on the Mount of Olives. In 1930 the seminary was divided into two parts : the senior seminary being established at Sharfeh on Mount Lebanon and the junior seminary remaining on the Mount of Olives ; both are under the care of the same Benedictine community.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, under the auspices of the Syrian patriarch and of the French Benedictines, a native Benedictine Congregation of Syrian monks is at present being formed. At Jerusalem itself, in 1906, the Benedictines of Beuron were given possession of the sanctuary of Our Lady of Mount Sion, the traditional spot of Our Lady's "falling asleep" (*Dormitio Mariae*). The house was erected into an abbey in 1926 ; for a time the community directed the seminary of the Latin patriarchate of Jerusalem.

Olivetan Benedictines have a mission at Baalbek and the Cistercians of Casamiri have been working very successfully to introduce their Benedictine observance among the Abyssinians.

In the West, seconding the wishes of His Holiness Pope Pius XI, the priory of Amay-Chevretogne has been established in Belgium since 1926 and is working with signal success to bring about more eirenic relations between the Eastern and Western Churches, having especially in mind the apostolate for Russia. According to the last official statistics (1935) the community numbered sixteen priests, eight clerics and two novices.<sup>2</sup> The monks celebrate the Divine Mysteries in both the Latin and Byzantine rites.

The North-American abbey of St. Procopius, Lisle, Ill., trains for the priesthood a number of Carpatho-Russian and Ukrainian students who take part together in the Slavonic services in the students' chapel. Lately two monks of the abbey were ordained to the priesthood in the Byzantine rite.<sup>3</sup>

Several other Benedictine communities might be named which are becoming actively interested in the apostolate for the Eastern churches.

\* \* \*

There is a last series of Benedictine contacts with the Eastern churches which should not be forgotten, namely, those made in the field of patristic literature. Among the Maurists, three names stand out as the leaders in Greek patristic studies : Montfaucon (d. 1741), editor of forty-five

<sup>1</sup> Ib., pp. 293-295.

<sup>2</sup> S.P. *Benedicti Familiae Confoederatae*, 1935. Rome, pp. 931-933.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *The Eastern Churches Quarterly*, Oct. 1940, p. 172.

folio volumes, comprising a collection of works of Greek Fathers, a Greek paleography, the *editio princeps* of the works of Athanasius, Chrysostom and Origen's Hexapla ; De la Rue (d. 1739) who edited the other volumes of Origen's works ; and Maran (d. 1762), editor of Justin, Cyril of Jerusalem, Basil and Gregory Nazianzen.

Other Benedictine scholars have followed in their footsteps : Dom Anselm Nickes (d. 1866), a German monk of St. Paul-outside-the-Walls, who edited the Acts of the Council of Florence in Greek and Latin ; Dom Pius Zingerle (d. 1881), a monk of Marienberg in Austria, the leading Syriac scholar of his day, author of *Monumenta Syriaca*, and *Chrysostomathia Syriaca*, discoverer of priceless Syriac codices, and translator of St. Ephrem's works into German ; Cardinal John Baptist Pitra (d. 1888) who, besides being the literary editor of Migne's Latin and Greek Patrology, himself contributed exhaustive studies on the Byzantine canon law and on Greek liturgical hymnography with special studies on St. Romanus the Melodist ; Cardinal Pitra's secretary, Dom Ildephonsus Guépin (d. 1917), who died abbot of Silos in Spain, published in 1874 his famous *Life of St. Josaphat*, the archbishop martyr of Catholic unity in Poland ; Dom C. Butler (d. 1934), abbot of Downside, is well known as the editor of the standard edition of the *Historia Lausiaca* : Dom Ludovicus Palacios (d. 1937), monk ofMontserrat and professor of Eastern languages at the Roman Benedictine university of Sant' Anselmo, before his martyrdom at the hands of Communists had already published sundry Syriac and Chaldaean grammars. Finally, we should mention the names of Dom Hugh Gaisser (d. 1920), monk of Maredsous and for some years rector of the Greek College of St. Athanasius in Rome, who worked most zealously to restore the purity of the Greek liturgical chant, and of Dom Julius Jeannin, who, in collaboration with Dom Julian Puyadé and Dom Anselm Chibas-Lasalle, all belonging to the community of Mount Olivet in Jerusalem, have published for the first time the Syrian and Chaldaean liturgical melodies<sup>1</sup>.

Many other workers in the same patristic field, with a bias towards Greek or Syriac patrology, are still alive : Dom Placid de Meester, monk of Maredsous, professor of the Greek College in Rome for the last forty years, who has specialized on the Byzantine rite ; Dom Hugh Connolly, monk of Downside, a leading Syriac scholar ; Dom John Chrysostom Baur, monk of Seckau, editor of St. John Chrysostom's works for the *Corpus PP. Viennense* and author of the most up-to-date

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Statistica . . . della Gerarchia di Rito Orientale*, p. 294, note.

*Life of St. John Chrysostom*; Dom Francis Moreau, monk of Ligugé, and Dom Julian Alameda, monk of Silos, authors of works on the Eastern liturgies.

Lastly the monks of Amay from their very foundation have published *Irenikon*, a periodical which makes valuable contribution to Eastern studies. And we feel it only right to mention here the *Eastern Churches Quarterly*—the editor, Dom Bede Winslow, a monk of Ramsgate, will pardon me for offending thus his modesty—a publication which, besides being a filial act of obedience to the wishes of the Holy See, is thoroughly in accord with the Benedictine traditions described above, and all unobtrusively helps to establish another eirenic contact between the Eastern and Western Churches.

DOM ROMANUS RIOS.

## CHRONICLE OF EVENTS

*Editor's Note*.—In this issue we can only give a very brief survey of the situation to date of the Eastern Churches as affected by the war. We may be able to have more detailed news in our next issue.

### CZECHOSLOVAKIA.

This was the first country invaded by the Nazis. The Catholics of the Byzantine rite here are the Podcarpathian Ruthenians numbering some 578,000, with two bishoprics. Part of this territory has now again been ceded to Hungary, hence this solid little block of Catholic Byzantines has been politically split in two.<sup>1</sup> The Orthodox Church in these parts numbers about 145,500, the majority of whom were formerly Catholic peasants in the Carpathians.

There are said to be a hundred of these Ruthenian Catholics<sup>2</sup> among the Czech soldiers in England.

### THE WESTERN UKRAINE.

*La Croix* publishes the following report from a reliable source on the position of the Catholic Church in Western Ukraine :—

“From reliable reports reaching Rome, one may infer that the three dioceses of Galicia, i.e. Leopol, Stanislaviv and Przemysl, are still free from open persecution, although

<sup>1</sup> For fuller detail see excellent article of Donald Attwater, “The War and the Catholic Orientals,” *The Tablet*, February 8th, 1941.

<sup>2</sup> *News Sheet*, February, 1941.

the circumstances are difficult and religious life is nearly impossible. The Bolsheviks confiscated all church property shortly after their arrival, but they still have to reckon with the people's loyalty to their faith. So far, no church has been closed, this being only possible where parishioners would like to get rid of their priest, which has not happened anywhere, or where the local Government would expel the priest, which would only be possible in places where the OGPU holds sway.

"As all big buildings have been taxed to the tune of from four to eight roubles per square yard, the parishioners will find it difficult to meet this burden. One parish in Leopol was taxed three thousand Polish zlotys, and its working population succeeded in gathering the money.

"In the villages, most of the Communists return to the Church after their experience of Bolshevism. Calumnies against the clergy do not go down among the people, particularly in Leopol, where the population looks upon Mgr. Szeptyckyj as a saint. All feasts of obligation have been suppressed, except the Sundays, but this year the parishes celebrated the Epiphany with the usual pomp. Even the solemn blessing of the waters—rivers, streams, tanks, etc. took place this year without interference, bishops and priests heading the crowds through the streets.

"Conditions vary much according to localities. Wherever opposition to the Communists is strong, priests are left alone, and allowed to keep some fifty acres of ground for their upkeep; whilst in one place a Communist majority voted the expulsion of the religious, and in some villages the priests have been deprived of all their property. It all depends on the attitude of the local Assembly towards the majority. Religious buildings have received less consideration. The Ecclesiastical Academy of Leopol, the seminaries of Stanislaviv and Przemysl, five monasteries of the Basilian Fathers, the houses of the Redemptorists of the Oriental rite and of the Sudite Fathers have all been confiscated. The Basilian Fathers have still eleven houses left which they share with soldiers, but without any support, and many have to look for work. The four hundred Basilian Sisters are the worst off, for they lost their schools and their convents and are now scattered among the population. The five hundred Sisters of the Immaculate Conception have met the same fate."

An eye-witness, returning from Leopol, writes in the Jugoslavian paper *Ruski Noviny* :—

"I have seen Red soldiers praying in the cathedral of St.

George in Leopol. They do not look about, as we do, but had tears in their eyes. I know one priest who keeps as a relic a rouble given to him by a Red officer to have a Mass said, and the man made the remark that many would do the same, only they were afraid of the Soviet Government."

According to a Vatican City report the Rector of the Lvov Theological Academy, Father Joseph Slipy, has been consecrated auxiliary bishop to Mgr. Szepticky, the aged and now bedridden Metropolitan.

Speaking of Russia, we have this encouraging report<sup>1</sup>: "To all appearances, Russia is a State that has closed its accounts with all religion; but though the Church has been persecuted for the last twenty years, the faith has not been eradicated from the masses, and a number of concessions have had to be made, as for instance the restoration of the famous Iwerskaja for veneration in a church.

"The Iwerskaja is the Eikon of the Iberian Mother of God, which for centuries had been venerated in the chapel on the Red square of the Iberian port. It was a thorn in the side of the Soviet powers, and it was removed. For years no one knew what had become of it. But in 1936 the population claimed its return. The authorities must have yielded, for today the Eikon stands again in its old place for public veneration. The incident is significant."

Also in the churches in Karelia (Finland) women for the most part officiate, that is they lead in the recitation of the prayers in the centre of the church but do not conduct any part of the service taken by the priest alone.<sup>2</sup>

#### RUMANIA.

Bessarabia and North Bukovina have been ceded to Stalin; nearly half of Transylvania has come under Hungary, and the Nazis have marched into the rest. Mr. Attwater speaks thus of these Byzantine Catholics: "There are about one and a third million of them and until 1918 they were under the crown of Hungary, since practically all of them lived in the Ardeal, that is, Transylvania. When they were joined with their fellow Rumanians of the 'Old Kingdom' in 1918 they were accorded the status of a sort of lesser national church, for they use the same Byzantine rites (in vernacular Rumanian) as the dominant Orthodox Church, and are racially Rumanian, whereas the Catholics in the Old Kingdom are of the Latin rite, and mostly of foreign origin; this

<sup>1</sup> See *The Tablet*, April 13th, 1940, p. 35.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., Nov. 30th, 1940, p. 431.

'precedence' over the Latins was recognized by the Holy See in the concordat of 1929."<sup>1</sup> The result of the war has been to cut this Rumanian Catholic Church in two and of course it affects the Rumanian Orthodox also.

### U.S.S.R.

Sir Paul Dukes has written two articles in *The Tablet* of great interest: "On 'courting' Stalin"<sup>2</sup> and "The German Character of Russian Bolshevism."<sup>3</sup> The first may be described as a careful study of a "calendar" of Stalin's pronouncements, an occupation that would be useful in these days to many Englishmen, statesmen and others, for unless we are careful to stand unwaveringly by the principles for which we say we took up arms the Muscovite ruler will be able to prove his taunt true that the honour of the Western democracies is nothing but a sham and an hypocrisy. But the second of the two studies is the most revealing, throwing a good deal of light on the position of Christianity in present Russia. Sir Paul shows that we must make a great distinction between the Russian Revolution and the Bolshevik Party. Bolshevism he shows is the Russian form of Marxism, and a comparatively recent German aberration, whereas the Russian Revolution dates back to "The Decembrists" of 1825 and is identified with the Russian renaissance, which is not dead but whose first stirrings, though held up by Marxism, are already making themselves heard. The revival of religion after twenty years of persecution speaks for itself—the soul of Russia is not dead!

Mr. Stephen Graham we think would agree with this but he would make three and not two divisions: the Russian of the Revolution, the Bolshevik, and Stalin.<sup>4</sup> And he thinks in considering this autocrat one should admit the possibility, however slight, of his breaking away from the Communist Party and identifying himself with the Russian people.

### FINLAND.

The Catholic Slav-Byzantine mission under Father Amand Caluvet, S.J., which was at Terrioki after many adventures has reassembled in Helsinki.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *The Tablet*, February 8th, 1941, p. 106.

<sup>2</sup> *The Tablet*, December 28th, 1940.

<sup>3</sup> *The Tablet*, January 11th, 1941.

<sup>4</sup> Stephen Graham's *News Letter*, September 1940, the editorial; also *ibid.*, December 1940, under Soviet Russia.

We may say in passing (from the same source of information) that Father Milner who was in Estonia is on his way to Palestine, having arrived at Constantinople.

The Finnish government has accepted the request of the committee of the Orthodox Church to transfer to Helsinki the residence of the bishop of the province of Viborg.<sup>1</sup>

#### POLAND.

Hitler's policy here in regard to the Orthodox Church is the reverse of Stalin's and also the reverse of his treatment of Catholics. Mgr. Dionysius seems now to be the recognised metropolitan; this move is viewed with mixed feelings by the Russian Orthodox.<sup>2</sup>

#### GREECE.

The Catholic population of Greece is small, about 50,000. Of these about 45,000 are of the Latin rite (largely descending from the period of Venetian control of the islands in the Aegean Sea), 1,000 Greeks of the Byzantine rite and about 3,000 Armenians.

The attack of Fascist Italy on Greece has not only brought forth the appeal of the Orthodox Church of Greece to Christendom<sup>3</sup> but also an appeal of the Association of the Catholics of Greece addressed to the Catholics of the world. A group of French Catholics in Athens have addressed a letter expressing their complete and Christian sympathy to the Archbishop of Athens and the whole of Greece.<sup>4</sup>

#### ALBANIA.

It is as well to make clear that Albania is not a Mohammedan country. Of its one million inhabitants one-third have remained Christian through 450 years of Turkish rule. There are about 100,000 Catholics of the Latin rite in the north; there is a very small group of the Byzantine rite; the Orthodox number about 250,000.

#### BULGARIA.

Bulgaria has given way reluctantly before the Nazi war machine. How far the reason for this is to be sought in the explanation of the Metropolitan Stefan of Sofia,<sup>5</sup> i.e., in

<sup>1</sup> *S.G.N.L.*, January, 1941.

<sup>2</sup> *S.G.N.L.*, December, 1940; January and February, 1941.

<sup>3</sup> *vid.*, *S.G.N.L.*, November, 1940.

<sup>4</sup> For both these *vid.*, *The Tablet*, 7th December, 1940.

<sup>5</sup> *vid.*, *S.G.N.L.*, February, 1941.

"the raising of the national flag above the Cross of Christ," seems to be open to question. King Boris<sup>1</sup> has certainly had a most difficult part to play.

#### JUGOSLAVIA.

In spite of their government the Jugoslavs have reacted and made a stand for freedom. The Patriarch Gavrilov has been a great and fearless leader in this cause. The boy King Peter II has been proclaimed and Serbs, Slovenes and Croats have rallied round him; may he live long and rule well!

#### CYPRUS.

The increasingly friendly relations between the British government in Cyprus and the local Orthodox Church have been further cemented since Britain came to the aid of Greece.

Some years ago there was anti-British and pro-Greek activity in the island and one of the three bishops, the Bishop of Kytion, was so rash as publicly to exert his influence on the pro-Greek side. In 1931 he and the Bishop of Kyrenia were banished for sedition. The former has since died and the latter is still living, as an old man of 80, in Athens. About a year after the banishment of the two bishops, the Archbishop of Nikosia, Cyrillos II, died, so that there was only one bishop, Leontios of Paphos, remaining in the island. No successor has yet been elected for the Archbishop, nor for the Bishop of Kytion. Many points of agreement and certain formalities are necessary between the government and the Church for an election, and the right man has never been forthcoming, but, although there was certainly much friction for some years, it is important to realize that there was never a definite break between the British government and the Orthodox Church in Cyprus.

The improvement in relations dates from the appointment of Lord Lloyd as Secretary of State for the Colonies. He both knew and understood the Cypriotes, and greater tact was used and much work began to be done to improve the schools and the general conditions in the island. Relations have steadily improved and, in the last two or three years, have become very friendly. Immediately England came to the aid of Greece, Mgr. Leontios called on the governor to express the wholehearted loyalty of the Orthodox Cypriotes to the common cause of Great Britain and Hellas, and the

<sup>1</sup> vid., excellent article by Lady Muir in *The Tablet*, January, 1941.

alliance of the two countries has naturally confirmed the already growing friendliness.

The Church of Cyprus, founded by St. Barnabas, was the first, more than a thousand years ago, to be declared independent of all Eastern patriarchs, but it followed Constantinople into schism. There are not now many Catholics on the island and most of these are of Latin rite and of foreign extraction, with the exception of a few Maronites, whose bishop lives in Syria.

#### ABYSSINIA.

It may be as well for our readers to have these two statements put side by side.

Mr. Graham in his *News Letter* (January 1941) says : "A special ecclesiastical organization directed from Rome has been established as an instrument for bringing Roman Catholic pressure to bear upon the Abyssinian Church."

Mr. Attwater writes in *The Tablet* (February 22nd, 1941) :<sup>1</sup> "Critics (including some Catholics who ought to have been better informed) alleged that after 1935 the Holy See took improper advantage of the Italian annexation. What, in fact, it did do was simply modify the previously existing ecclesiastical organization to meet new conditions in a reasonable way. The 'huge new Roman organization' was nothing more than the subdivision of the existing three vicariates and prefecture into four vicariates (Addis Ababa, Eritrea, Harrar, Jimma) and four prefectures (Dessie, Gondar, Neghelli, Tigre). Even the statement that a new delegation apostolic was set up in 1937 is less than half true. The delegate apostolic for Egypt exercised that office also for Abyssinia from 1929 : there is now a separate delegate for Italian East Africa, but he is the same person as the vicar apostolic of Addis Ababa.

"More significant were the changes in the personnel of the European clergy, changes which were far from originating with the Holy See.<sup>2</sup> The Italian government would not tolerate the presence of French priests in Abyssinia, and they had to go ; even, eventually, the beloved Mgr. Andrew Jarosseau, of the Capuchins (lately dead), who had laboured as a vicar apostolic among the Gallas since 1900. Among those who replaced them were missionaries of the Milan and Verona societies...

<sup>1</sup> The whole article, "The Church in the Italian Empire" is excellent.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Graham makes it clear, later on, that he does not identify Mussolini's policy with that of the Holy See.

"In Eritrea, which has been an Italian province for over fifty years, and where Catholic work has been largely through the Ethiopic rite, there are only some 28,000 Abyssinian Catholics in a population of over 620,000. . .

"Probably the most promising development under Italian rule has been the sending of a number of young aspirants to do a Cistercian novitiate at the abbey of Casamiri; these monks have now returned, and are establishing a monastery of Ethiopic rite in their own land."

#### JAPAN.

In the July of 1940 the synod of the Orthodox Church in Japan decided to become independent of the Moscow patriarchate.<sup>1</sup> Bishop Sergius resigned and has been succeeded by Father Heikichi Ivasava, a former graduate of the Moscow Theological Academy; he had also acted as auxiliary both to Archbishop Nicholas (the Russian founder of the Japanese mission) and Bishop Sergius.

The Orthodox Japanese Church has been independent since<sup>2</sup> 1912, though not autocephalous. It has always had a Russian bishop at the head until last year. It now has a Japanese clergy and the faithful number about 35,000.

#### LEBANON.

From the Melkites. A letter, written last May but not received till September, from the Superior General of the Salvatorian Basilians, the Archimandrite Nicolas Borkhoche, contains the news that a beginning has been made with a foundation of missionary sisters to work alongside the monks, who have been working for 250 years in the Near East and for 50 years in America. Permissions to make the foundation came from Rome scarcely a month before war was declared. After much thought and prayer the superior general decided that a beginning should nevertheless be made as soon as possible, in spite of pecuniary difficulties. At the time of writing all the preparations had been made and the building materials were ready.

#### PARIS.<sup>3</sup>

The German authorities have closed the Russian Theological Faculty in Paris and its famous Russian library. Several

<sup>1</sup> vid., *The Catholic Herald*, 20th December, 1940.

<sup>2</sup> *S.G.N.L.*, March, 1941.

<sup>3</sup> *The Tablet*, 3rd May, 1941.

Russian bishops and priests were threatened with arrest if they refused to accede to German demands and recognize only one jurisdiction for Russians, that of Karlovitis. Archbishop Alexander has been arrested in Belgium and the metropolitan Eulogius of Paris is expecting the same fate. Nicholas Berdiaev, who refused to go to America and leave his books and manuscripts, is now lying dangerously ill.

## OBITUARY

## MGR. GREGORY HAJJAR

News has reached England of the death in a motor accident of the Lord Gregory Hajjar, Melkite Bishop of St. John-of-Akka (Ptolemais), in Palestine.

Mgr. Gregory, who was sixty-five years old, was a conspicuous figure in the religious life of Palestine and an outstanding hierarch of the Byzantine rite. He was born at Raim, a hill village in the Lebanon, and became a monk of the Basilian congregation of the Holy Saviour. Shortly afterwards, when only twenty-six years old, he was appointed Bishop of Akka, whose residence is now a few miles away from that ancient town, at Haifa at the foot of Mount Carmel. For ten years he was the youngest bishop in the world and until recently he was the only Catholic Byzantine bishop in Palestine (Jerusalem has a vicar of the Melkite Patriarch of Antioch). After the war of 1914-18 Mgr. Gregory set himself with great vigour to the apostolate among his fellow countrymen, with such energy and success that he became popularly known as the "Archbishop of Galilee," and indeed would so sign himself.

Trusted and encouraged by the local representatives of Great Britain, Mgr. Hajjar built many new churches,<sup>1</sup> and schools, reconciled many dissident Orthodox with the Holy See, and began to give the Melkite Catholics the position of importance and respect that they ought by right to have in the Holy Land. It was largely due to him that it became necessary in 1932 to form another Melkite eparchy, east of the river Jordan, with its see at Amman.

Mgr. Gregory was a man of unusually impressive appearance and dignity, with his flowing hair and beard and oriental

<sup>1</sup> Built of local stone in the local tradition these very numerous new churches of his look as if they had been part of the life of their villages and towns for generations, though interiorly too many of them still lack an eikonastasis.

features, of the type traditionally associated with our Lord. Mgr. Gregory knew England and some years back attended the International Eucharistic Congress at Dublin.

Gregory Hajjar is a great loss to the Byzantine episcopate, and those who visited him in his house at Haifa, where he maintained something of the old Greco-Arab way of living, are not the only ones to hear of his passing with great regret. "Through the prayers of the apostles, the martyrs, the holy bishops and of all the blessed, do Thou, O Lord, Who art merciful and full of loving kindness, give rest to the soul whom Thou hast called" (*troparion* from the Byzantine Liturgy for the dead).

## NEWS AND COMMENTS THE ANGLICAN PAPALISTS.

*The Clergy Review.* In the January issue Dr. Holland has written a most excellent article entitled "The Anglican Papalists." It is the only attempt we have come across (at any rate in this century) of an English Catholic priest treating the subject from a theological point of view and although it is slightly involved in places, doubtless due to want of space and the textbook form of the treatment, it is on the whole a clear and well reasoned setting out of the case and should not only be read and pondered over by the Catholic clergy but should also be placed before the Anglican clergy that they may see that it is not only Catholics of the Continent who try to understand their position. The author only offers it as a "*possible solution*"; he sets out the question thus: "How may one justify and formulate, within the limits of Catholic theology, a constructive view of the relations of the Holy Ghost to the Anglican Papalist movement?"

*Principles:* If we may summarise the principles which the author gives in an already sketchy and technical treatment, they may be stated thus: There is only one "instrumentum coniunctum" of the Holy Spirit's action, viz., the Church of Christ. There can be many "instrumenta separata," e.g., the Orthodox Church for valid confessions, etc. Since the true Church is one and undivided, such use of "separated instruments," achieved in virtue of their *de facto* conjunction with the true Church, must be carefully distinguished from the organic workings of the Holy Spirit within the Church.

The organic action within the Church must also be distinguished from the "assimilative" action of the Holy Ghost

upon subjects outside the Church. "Omnis gratia Spiritus S. tendit ad unionem Corporis Mystici."

We must distinguish in the "assimilative action" the production of two states :

- i. being indwelt by the Holy Spirit by sanctifying grace ;
- ii. being under the organic action of the Holy Spirit in the visible union of the Church. They may be produced simultaneously, or either one before the other ; they are never produced without reference to each other. In the present study only the last mentioned kind of "assimilative action" is referred to.

The process of assimilation may be : solitary, or in company (family, community, church) ; in other words, with—or without—the aid of a social tie. In all cases, however, the process is chiefly positive—not negative, i.e., consists in perfecting what is already possessed rather than in uprooting what is wrong. (Cf. Newman, *Essay on Development*, p. 88. London, Toovey, 1846).

*Analysis* : Again this is but a summary. Papalism is a special movement within the High-Church party of the Establishment. The specific element is direct approach to the Roman Communion.

Corporate Reunion becomes the crux of the analysis. This is the characteristic joint-product of the common and specific elements of Papalism. A distinction must be made between Corporate Reunion : (i) strictly so called, i.e., under the hierarchy of the separated church, which can be complete or partial ; (ii) less strictly, i.e., where reunion is achieved (completely or in part) under religious leaders, who, whatever their standing, cannot be properly regarded as a hierarchy ; this can be equated with mass-conversion and can occur in a church, a parish, or a community. Now as regards the Anglican Church, their lack of a valid hierarchy does indeed make the first kind of Corporate Reunion impossible ; and that, unfortunately, is the kind of reunion of which the Anglican-papalists are alone thinking at present. Yet it is not the only kind of Corporate Reunion which should be discussed. The following letter seems important enough to be quoted in extenso : "And first allow me to tell you that it is not correct that at Rome we confine ourselves to the desire for individual conversions. The truth is only that we do not want individual conversions, the success of which is more immediate and easier, to be hindered while Corporate Union is being considered." (Cardinal Rampolla to Lord

Halifax, letter dated 24th August, 1896; cf. *Leo XIII and Anglican Orders*, p. 351.<sup>1</sup>

Father Holland then gives some conclusions of which he further gives elucidations and finally sets out some practical consequences of his theory. We need only consider the first two of his conclusions since they concern the pith of his thesis.

*Conclusions:* I. The specific element of the Anglican Papalist movement may be a *per se* effect of the assimilative action of the Holy Spirit who permits the common element to subsist for a good purpose, which possibly is a wide-scale return of separated Christians to the visible unity of the Mystical Body.

II. However wide the scale of this return, its scope cannot be Corporate Reunion in the strict sense; and that, not merely for the lack of a valid hierarchy, but rather for the lack of any principle of dogmatic authority; which further makes highly unlikely any mass-return even remotely commensurate with the total membership of the Establishment.

The first conclusion is "positive," but the extent of the terms should be noted. No brief is there held for the subjective views of the men actually in the movement, at least as regards the conditions of its fulfilment.

He further justifies this constructive analysis thus: If the tendency towards greater subjection to the Holy See be *per se bonum*, and if again the process of assimilation directly promoted by the Holy Ghost be realizable with the help of a social bond outside that of the true Church, and again be gradual and positive, it seems that nothing in Catholic theology can exclude the possibility of the Holy Ghost granting an illustration of intellects and a motion of wills simultaneously to a number of men bound in the common invincible ignorance of certain articles of faith, though possessing implicit belief in all.

The second conclusion defines the limits of this attraction of separated Christians *en masse*. It is negative in so far as it excludes entirely "corporate reunion" in the strict sense; negative too in that it looks for no really representative movement of Anglicans, but the underlying contention is decidedly positive.

Out of the six practical consequences the most important

<sup>1</sup> The original was in French—"Et tout d'abord, permettez-moi de vous dire qu'il n'est pas exact qu'à Rome on se borne à désirer des conversions individuelles ne voulant pas l'union en corps; il est vrai seulement qu'on ne veut pas d'entraves aux conversions individuelles, dont le succès est plus proche et plus facile, tandis que l'on s'occupe de l'union en corps."

one to stress is, we think, this : Since it is contended that the movement as a *social* entity is the work of the Holy Spirit (and there largely is the speciality of the view), it follows that one obstructs the assimilative action in refusing to approach the Papalists as other than so many individuals. "God does nothing in vain," and however tenuous may be the bond of union among the Papalists (other than the common bond of Anglican communion), it should be treasured and promoted by us. Meetings, therefore, at which we can address Papalists as a socially united body, etc. There would be nothing astray in our expressing hopes for "group-reunion," working for that, and above all, praying for that ; rather we should be imitating a very sound precedent. (The author gives as reference Leo XIII, *Amantissimae Voluntatis*, 27th April, 1895, "Letter to the English People.")

Here then is Father Holland's thesis in a summarised form. He very rightly throughout insists on the distinction to be made between Corporate Reunion strictly so called and that less strictly, and to this latter he would give the name "social reunion." He also says that in the case of the Anglicans this is the only possible form of "corporate reunion," and rejects the other not merely for the lack of a valid hierarchy, *but rather for the lack of any principle of dogmatic authority.*

Now, although not entirely gainsaying the last remark we would put forward some facts that we think will mitigate this assertion somewhat.

- i. First we think it is important to make a distinction between the Establishment, i.e., the Church of England in this country (how long will it remain established ?), and the Anglican Communion elsewhere, e.g., in Scotland or Wales, in Central and South Africa, or in the United States of America, etc. In the former the expression of any dogmatic authority is greatly hampered by the state, in the latter it is not to such an extent.
- ii. Then, is not the present realization of the necessity of a definite Christian education in the country after the war going to help to bring about some sort of dogmatic authority ? Will not the people demand it ?
- iii. Again, has the real importance of the years of official and quasi-official relations between the Anglican Church and the Orthodox Churches, though only in the last twenty years or so showing its effect among the rank and file of Anglicans, been sufficiently considered by Catholics ? (We will deal with this subject

in some detail on another occasion ; it is by no means only a question of some Orthodox Churches recognising Anglican Orders).

Father Holland allows that the Holy Spirit permits the *common element* to subsist for a good purpose, which possibly is a wide scale return of separated Christians to the visible unity of the Mystical Body ; he also allows that even the Establishment is an instrumentum separatum, yet he would seem to quote<sup>1</sup> Cardinal Newman (cf. *Difficulties of Anglicans*, Vol I., London, Longman's, 1901), in favour of the opposite opinion. It would take too long to examine the very difficult question that is thus raised. But surely, in spite of Anglicanism being in transition, a great change in the direction of Catholic outlook has come over the Anglican episcopate since the days of Newman. We are inclined to think that there is a very large and growing movement towards Catholic Unity, considered in more general terms, throughout the whole Anglican Communion of which the Anglo-Orthodox group form a solid and important part (this movement of course does not come within the real scope of Dr. Holland's article). This movement then can be considered much more representative of the Church of England. And it is with a view to this larger movement that the Anglican Papalists and we too should work, setting forth (as our author suggests) unpolemically the nature of the papacy—especially so as to bring out the mystical nature of the Church and the relations between the pope, the bishops and the faithful. It is again both with this movement in view as also on account of its own intrinsic worth that we should show forth the Church's liturgical and patristic tradition together with her esteem for Holy Scripture. By this we will also help to deepen the Anglican-Papalist movement, for though a study of the decrees of Trent and the Vatican Council together with a knowledge of the Scholastics are necessary for the proper understanding of the Church, the former sources go to the very roots of both Catholic dogma and spiritual life. And, we would add, in dealing with Anglicans, the study of the "pietas Anglicana" should not be neglected.

We cannot end these comments without reiterating what

<sup>1</sup> One of the most valuable parts of the article is Father Holland's list of references, at the end, they certainly give great weight to the thesis, hence it is a little surprising that he does not seem to have read Père Congar's *Divided Christendom* (Geoffrey Bles, 1939), it is certainly relevant to his subject. Also the book *Anglo-Catholicism and Orthodoxy* by W. A. Visse't Hooft (S.C.M. Press, 1933) is a very useful comment of a Continental Protestant.

Father Holland himself lays stress on, namely that in all this work for Corporate Reunion in the less strict sense of the word never is it lawful for individuals, who are convinced of their duty to be reconciled with the Church *hic et nunc*, to remain outside on the plea that they can do more good by remaining where they are. So did Cardinals Rampolla and Wiseman make clear the mind of Rome to all Catholics and others working for this cause.

### THE OECUMENICAL SPIRIT

*Blackfriars.* The March number of this monthly has devoted much space to the question of Christian Unity. Father Henry St. John, in an article entitled "Spadework for Reunion," shows that in our present new world (born in the years that have intervened between the last war and this one), the problem of reunion has entered into a new phase; it has passed from the realm of war-psychology to that of a psychology of peace, and that Catholics should adapt themselves to this new position with its great opportunities. We have no need to consider the Church in a state of siege, at least on the part of our fellow Christians, and hence we have no need to stress those special points of our Faith that have been attacked in the past. Rather we are living alongside of our fellow Christians in an age stark with materialism in which the very foundations of Christianity are called in question, hence our need to bring to the fore such fundamental truths; as the Church being the Mystical Body of Christ, that through grace Christ lives in us and we in Him, so the fellowship of all those who are baptized both with Christ and with one another, etc. With such teaching we have much in common with our separated brethren. The writer briefly reviews the rise of the "œcumical movement" and its method of approach to doctrinal differences. He shows how during the last ten years this movement has come to recognize that a mere federal unity, founded not on doctrinal agreement, but solely upon goodwill and a general acceptance of what were termed fundamentals, was quite inadequate. He also gives the two underlying ideas of the œcumical spirit thus: first, that controversial opposition, war-psychology, can and does distort truth, not so much in the way it is held and lived as in the way it presents itself to the outsider, and that the first necessity for getting at truth is to dissipate the spirit of war-psychology. The other idea is that heresy and schism have often arisen from what began as quite genuine reforming movements.

He analyses further, "the œcumical spirit, then, may be described as a spirit of friendliness, sympathy and mutual understanding; a spirit which lays aside the psychology of war and rejects all controversy of the win-a-victory type, and which without surrendering one iota of principle attempts really to enter into the minds of those who differ from us, trying to understand by careful and patient probing what the real extent of those differences is, and what first caused them to arise. Those who are actuated by this spirit, and who adopt this method of approach to the differences which divide Christians, are as a rule profoundly convinced that the ultimate work of bringing about the unity of Christendom is not the work of men, but of God." He asks the question, can Catholics make this spirit their own: a characteristically Catholic attitude? His answer is yes; not, however, in the sense that Catholics should take any part in the non-Catholic œcumical movement, that is a question for authority to decide, but the spirit that is described above they can and should certainly make their own. Above all he stresses the need for Catholics to acquire, by prayer, a great desire for Christian unity.

In another article Father Vincent McNabb comments on "The Joint Letter on the Five Peace Points." "An event," he says, "without precedent in England for four centuries took place when in this joint letter the Five Peace Points of Pope Pius XII were accepted by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, the Moderator of the Free Church Federal Council and Cardinal Hinsley."

He reprints the document from *The Times* (December 21st, 1940), and places it both in its *present setting*—from the point of view of a prominent non-Catholic member of Parliament, and in its *historical setting*, tracing the relation between the English people and the Church of Rome in the past, and stresses the full courage entailed in the writing of the letter. "In spite of not a few for whom the Pope's wise policy has been subtly anti-British, these leaders of our Christian life have proclaimed the Pope's policy as moral and political wisdom. Something akin to vision and heroism was behind the unexpectedness of this effort towards the way of peace."

Due recognition is also given to the pioneer work of the late Archbishop Davidson and how his mantle has fallen on his one-time secretary chaplain, Dr. Bell, now bishop of Chichester. The Bishop's recent book, *Christianity and World Order*, is also noted with its own reference to collaboration with the Pope.

And lastly, the editorial entitled, "That they all may be One," in which the importance and nature of authority is investigated and answers are given to the critics who blame Rome for tyranny and centralization. It shows how from the very nature of the attack at the Reformation the Church was forced at the Council of Trent to restore monarchical control to the papacy. But it goes on to say that this state of centralization is not the normal condition of the religious society that is the Church, and the opportunity of the present time to return to the normal condition, in the interests of Christian Unity, is stressed : " This spontaneous and unprejudiced trend towards union comes at a time when Catholics can offer a distribution of ecclesiastical authority that has not been possible since the Reformation. For the war, having broken up communications, has made it difficult to keep in close touch with the Vatican. Hence local authorities will receive an increase of those powers that are not essential to the centre of unity, the papacy. In occupied France it is reported that bishops and even priests have received extremely wide powers from Rome. This is an immediate opportunity for us, and we should explain the significance to other Christians, many of whom are kept from the Church through a mistaken notion of its "Romishness." We are accused of intransigence and exclusiveness—and we must be so in matters of truth. Here is an occasion for generous readjustment, since no doctrine is involved. We can show that to reunite Christendom we would take any step that did not lead off the narrow way of truth. It is a development that should be welcomed by those Anglicans who desire to preserve a truly English form of Christianity.

"But if we offer greater powers of self-government to an English Catholic Church, we must demand from those seeking unity an assent to the ultimate principle of union between human wills. We cannot move from the one basic authority, and they should realize the reasonableness of that position. If the gaps in the walls of Christendom are to be built up, it must be in a spirit of give and take, and we have a unique opportunity for this today—to give a single authority, to take an English mode of it. Others must submit to the obedience of Papal authority, we must make that obedience an English thing directed immediately to an English authority, subordinate to the Papacy, but with full independence in all matters that are not essential to the Papacy."

Such a line of action would indeed be of vital importance, not only in England but also in the Christian East.

## ST. BASIL'S HOUSE.

The idea of such a centre had been in the minds of many members of the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius for some time, and the idea has now been realized, at any rate at a beginning, largely through the kindness of the Rev. Vers Ducker, vicar of All Saints', Hertford. The idea is partly to have a centre for the Fellowship, but also to carry on, as best may be, the work of the Paris Orthodox Theological Academy in England with the nucleus of its members who happen to be here and the co-operation of some other Orthodox and Anglican friends. The graduates of the Academy at present in England are Dr. Zernov himself, Eugen Lampert, a dogmatic theologian, and Clement Naumov, a liturgist.

So the tradition of the Theological Academy of St. Sergius will be carried on here in the heart of England. It is to be sincerely hoped that it will not confine itself only to a Russian tradition but will embrace that of Greece too. If care be taken one can foresee a great future for such a work, a good library, a group of research scholars (here Anglicans will be an additional help) and the publishing of documents and treatises on the Orthodox philosophy and theology in English. This cannot but help, not only the Orthodox themselves but the English too, to build up a genuine Christian tradition in this country.

## THE METHODIST SACRAMENTAL FELLOWSHIP.

The objects of the Fellowship shall be :—

- (a). To re-affirm the Faith that is formulated in the Nicene Creed—the faith that inspired the Evangelical Revival and the hymns of the Wesleys.
- (b). To restore in Methodism the sacramental worship of the Universal Church, as set forth in the lifelong practice and teaching of the Wesleys.
- (c). Reunion. Adhering to the principles of the Reformation, yet being convinced that the divisions of the Church militant are becoming ever more clearly contrary to the will of God, the Fellowship works and prays for the corporate reunion of all believers.

## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

A CORRECTION FROM CANON I. A. DOUGLAS.

DEAR FATHER,

I have read Father Gill's contributions in the current EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY with great interest and with appreciation though that appreciation is at times mingled with a little criticism. He makes however one mistake: five and not four Orthodox autocephalous Churches have affirmed the acceptability of Anglican Orders by economy, namely Constantinople, Alexandria, Jerusalem, Cyprus and Rumania.

My congratulations upon the EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY which makes me more than ever ashamed that my laziness keeps *The Christian East* in suspense.

IHON. A. DOUGLAS.

### THE PLATONIC TRADITION AND THE LITURGY.

DEAR SIR,

I must thank Father Crichton for his reply; he certainly enlightens me somewhat. I am inclined to agree with him that perhaps the object of the *intuitus* is a verum-bonum and the motion towards it a mixed one of knowledge-love. I think the motion could also be expressed by Newman's *real assent*. But I cannot help feeling that there was a real dividing in the West with St. Bernard. With the last paragraph I entirely agree. I hope that the whole question of the Christian Platonic tradition will still be examined in the text of future numbers of this journal.

Yours, etc.,

K.F.E.W.

### THE INFLUENCE OF LATIN CHRISTIANITY IN THE EAST.

*Egypt.*

DEAR SIR,

The correspondence on this difficult problem has interested me greatly, but it seems to me that the elements of the problem vary very much in different countries, largely in proportion to the degree of sophistication of the population, but also to the bulk of Latin inhabitants of the country, to the tangled history of schism and reunion, and to the training which

the priests receive. For that reason it is difficult to make generalizations intended to fit all "Eastern Christians," as though they formed a small sect, with no history, in a single locality. The experience of so many writers in France and England is confined to the Russian Emigration, the rest being book-knowledge; and they are inclined to generalize rather unwisely from this one example which is not very typical and a somewhat exotic growth by comparison with anything one meets here.

Here, of course, one is thinking primarily in terms of Copts and Greeks, but particularly Copts, though there are certain complications to the problem which are common to all the Near Eastern countries, but are largely absent from the Greek and Slavonic countries of Europe. These are chiefly due to the great number of rites existing side by side in a single place. In Egypt nearly every dissident and united body that exists is represented and that in the midst of a predominantly Mohammedan population. The result is that not one of the united groups is large enough or strong enough to preserve that degree of independence that would safeguard its integrity.

Then the Copts are very far from being sophisticated. They have not the degree of education that would enable them to choose the way they will go by a really critical judgment. The consequence is that some of the most valuable things in their spirit and tradition are liable to be jettisoned if they are brought into close contact with any strong counter-influence.

The dissident Copts at their worship have a simplicity and spontaneity that has impressed me very much. They really enjoy it and live it; they burst into their singing and their cymbals. Perhaps this spontaneity will seem far from an advantage to many Englishmen: a stranger is seen in the church and, in order to honour him, the book is placed on his head and he is asked to read the next lesson; someone likes a lesson and decides to read it twice; the Epiphany water is being blessed in the cathedral in a leaden trough on a small table in front of the old patriarch, and under the table are a number of bottles complete with whisky labels, presumably partaking in the blessing; the choir, commonly composed of blind singers, has to be prompted to begin and almost everyone else has to be prompted for less clear reasons; a woman in the gallery appears to know the whole liturgy by heart and sings, in a loud male voice, the parts of priest, singers, people and all, Coptic and Arabic.

All this, I suppose, runs exceedingly counter to the order

and decorum of the Western, and particularly of the English tradition of worship, but yet I cannot help feeling that it is alive and of the people in a way that our tradition, both Catholic and Anglican, perhaps is not, at the present day. I know many people living in Egypt would disagree. They say that there is a fantastic ignorance in the people, the priests doing nothing and being completely uneducated themselves ; but it seems to me that their religious education is of the same type as that of the unlettered people of the Middle Ages. They can tell you remarkably much of the Bible in showing you their churches and eikons and the entire life history of a great many saints.

With the Catholic Copts one does not feel that it is thus "of the people," but outside and self-conscious, though they undoubtedly have greater advantages of education. One wonders how reunion with such a simple people *can* come about without doing incalculable harm. It is not that the Catholic Church would do harm or that they would need to lose once full corporate reunion was effected—then they could be living their own life to the right extent. It is during the reunion *process* that the harm must get done. In the first place it is a self-conscious process ; in the second, it is a period of contact and comprehension of the West, which can hardly result in anything but reaction or imitation, the papal desire for the preservation of the integral Eastern traditions notwithstanding. The fountainhead of the Church is Rome, which is the Latin Patriarchate. Knowing that and not distinguishing between the essential and unessential, they feel that they are getting more into the centre of the Church to which they are reunited by imitating Latin ways—but "unity in diversity" is the Catholic principle.

The small united bodies feel themselves to be no more than side-chapels of the Latin rite, and this inferiority-complex results either in people changing their rite to Latin, in spite of papal legislation, or else in the half-measure of imitation and the resulting hybrid. The Greek, above all, has not a minority mind—he cannot imagine himself as anything but "the Church"—and does not accept easily a minority position, and this is true, though perhaps in a lesser degree, of other Eastern Christians. Though these small united bodies are really there to represent, during this time of division, a great tradition that is an integral part of the Catholic Church, the bulk and dominance of the Latin rite is a much more obvious fact. In reality, however small their numbers, they are as important as this numerically vast Latin rite and there is no superior and inferior between them, but, in point

of fact, a historical sense is probably needed to keep this clearly in mind. Out here, too, the Latin Church is much more in evidence, with its big churches, orders and regular life.

One realises what an extraordinarily difficult position the Eastern Catholic bodies are in. They are too small to be self-supporting. They necessarily lean on one side and that side is necessarily the bulk of the *Church* to which they belong—that is Latin—rather than of the *rite* to which they belong—that is dissident—and that affects their mentality, if nothing else. In education, for instance, though the different rites have their small schools, for more advanced education some pooling of resources is necessary, and that results in Latin, Coptic, Greek Byzantine, Melkite, Maronite, Syriac rite children all being educated together as they are in the Jesuit school in Cairo. With the best will in the world it is not possible to bring all these children up really saturated in their own traditions.

It is only the Holy Ghost who can give the light to unravel the tangles of disunity and guide Christians into the unity of Christ's Body and who can preserve the full richness of the Church, the unity in diversity. It is obviously prayer that is needed most of all. We need to look at the problem from above rather than on a level. Beyond prayer, the training of the priests makes the most difference, and then, I think, the attitude of Latin Catholics, especially in the Near East itself. If they were a little humbler and went out of their way to show their respect and appreciation of the great Eastern traditions, it might help a great deal. That again is a matter of a gradual, steady education of mind throughout the Church, which has, please God, begun.

Yours faithfully,

J.B.

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS

*Fathers and Heretics.* By G. L. Prestige, D.D. (S.P.C.K.)  
The Bampton Lectures for 1940. pp. 426. 12s. 6d.

Dr. Prestige's last book, *God in Patristic Thought*, has earned for him a reputation of patristic learning which assures a welcome for any other work he may give to the public. Nor are we in any way disappointed in the book before us though it has taken on a more popular presentation.

In the present book the author sets out the harmony of the faith (*analogia fidei*) by bringing vividly before us some of the great Fathers and heretics of the first five Christian centuries, realizing that a sympathetic understanding of the disharmony is as important for our study of the truth as is a knowledge of the lives and statements of the orthodox Fathers.

In a prologue (the first lecture), Dr. Prestige deals with the Scriptural basis of Tradition. He shows us very clearly what the Fathers meant by *didascalia* and what by *paradosis* and goes to great lengths of scriptural illustration to explain how tradition means delivery, that is not the *handing down* but the *handing over* of the object concerned by the first party. The *traditio symboli* (for example) was the solemn delivery into the mental keeping of the neophyte of the articles of the faith into which he was to be baptised. The contents and substance of this tradition is then to be found first in the original doctrine "traditioned" by the apostles to the Church, and of which the Bible is reckoned the principal part; it was further insisted that a process of interpretation was required in order to extract tradition that was enshrined in the Bible, hence the vast commentaries published by the Fathers on the various books of Holy Scripture; and thirdly, it was sought in a yet remoter background, i.e., the meaning of the Bible was consciously sought in relation to its context in Christian institutions, in particular in the sacraments, the creeds, and the episcopate. Thus did the Fathers understand Tradition.

The author then in six lectures considers the harmony of the faith under these heads: Faith in a Divine Saviour; the claims of religious intelligence; the Unity of God; Divine Irruption; Redeemed Humanity; and one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism.

For our study of the first of these, Pope Callistus and the Roman Church of the second century are set before our view, with the practical and optimistic Christian view of salvation centring round the historic person of Jesus Christ, true God and true Man as opposed to the ideas of salvation entertained by pagan Hellenistic circles and as conceived in the Gnostic systems.

The second theme is embodied in a brilliant essay on Origen. This includes a sketch of his life and a detailed analysis of his works; his work on Holy Scripture, the Commentary on St. John, the "Hexapla," and his work of systematic theology, i.e., his "First Principles." Dr. Prestige thus sums up his work: "The Church owes it to Origen, first and foremost, that, whenever Christianity is true to

itself, it is a rational faith. The whole educated world is in his debt for the preservation of the old Hellenic intellectual culture, which he transformed by his genius into the beginnings of a *philosophia perennis* for Christendom" (p. 133).

In the next lecture our author treats in similar fashion St. Athanasius and shows how the saint did not merely save the Nicene creed but in fact Christianity. He explains in detail why in "setting out the Latin faith in Greek language, 'unius substantiae' was translated by 'homoousion,'" and in passing suggests "that the exile of Athanasius in the West was providential in uniting valuable strains of thought which had been geographically divorced, as was, indisputably, the later exile of Hilary in Asia Minor." And also while treating fully the Catholic doctrine of the Unity of God, Dr. Prestige does not ignore what may be learned from Sabellianism or from Emanationism.

In the treatment of Apollinaris we have an example of the author's sympathetic judgment in the case of a heretic; he shows clearly the gravity of his error yet at the same time he in no way underestimates his importance as an orthodox theologian up to the time of his fall, and for that matter he realizes the permanent value of his contribution to Truth even though the contributor himself in the end follows a false path. Nestorius receives a similar treatment though Apollinaris is of the two a more worthy character. His treatment too of St. Cyril of Alexandria in the next lecture is excellent. It is, therefore, rather a shock to find in the same lecture such a lack of judgment when Dr. Prestige comes to touch on the position of the Church of Rome and of the Pope in the patristic age; here he seems to let his prejudice get the better of his scholarship. For those who wish for a detailed criticism of Dr. Prestige's views on the matter the review of this book in *The Downside Review* (January 1941, pp. 110-117) should be read.

The final lecture "Eros: or Devotion to the Sacred Humanity" is of the greatest interest, it is largely a study (in outline) of the early Catholic traditional and liturgical outlook on prayer and worship contrasted with the individualistic and devotional outlook that began with St. Bernard and was carried through the Reformation and Counter-Reformation period up to the present time. He makes due mention of the liturgical revival of recent years.

The whole book is full of the most solid scholarship put in a very popular way.

DOM BEDE WINSLOW.

*The Catholic Church and Corporate Reunion.* By Herbert Rees, Minor Canon of St. Paul's. A study of the relations between East and West from the Schism of 1054 to the Council of Florence. (Dacre Press, Westminster). 1940. pp. 20 + iv.

This study is obviously inspired by an earnest mind, full of good will, and it is written in a perfectly conciliatory spirit; if only for this reason it deserves a generous meed of praise. Moreover Canon Rees has gathered here an imposing array of facts and quotations which he marshals with ease and scholarly directness. He discusses the ecclesiastical relations between East and West from approximately 1050 to 1450. During this period the differences between the Eastern and Western Churches, which had begun by being rather racial, national and political in character, developed and finally emerged as a hierarchical, and eventually a doctrinal, rift. The Canon's facts and quotations, with the exception of some minor and subordinate points to be touched on later, are true history and therefore beyond cavil. The same, however, cannot be said of his interpretation, if we wish to interpret them from the viewpoint of our traditional Catholic theology and canon law.

The origins of the schism were certainly political and jurisdictional. The Patriarchs of the New Rome aspired to equal rights with the Patriarch of the Old Rome and the Byzantine emperors usually backed them up in their ambition. Byzantium moreover never forgave the Pope for crowning a Westerner as Holy Roman Emperor and thus severing his political connection with Constantinople. We may go even further back and point to Constantine the Great himself as the initiator of the Graeco-Roman misunderstandings. In his book on the Greek Schism, Abbot Dom Luigi Tosti, O.S.B., has this poetical but perfectly true heading: How Constantine the Great, while protecting the Church, let fall the first seeds of the Greek Schism (*Come Costantino il Grande, proteggendo la Chiesa, si lasciasse cader di mano i germi dello scisma greco*). Certain it is too that had not the Crusaders established a Latin empire in the East, the Greek Schism would probably have been healed long ago and without much difficulty. Again, it is quite possible that in the early years of the estrangement the ultimate issue, viz. a formal schism with its present day theological implications, was not by any means fully visualized. All these considerations and others of a similar nature certainly help to excuse in part, never to justify, the lamentable break between East and West. So far we are in agreement with the author's thesis.

There are, however, several pages in his study, which Catholic historians and theologians would re-write in a slightly different form. For example, in the description of the Church given by the Canon on page three, I would intercalate a few phrases here and there, as follows : "The Catholic Church knows only one basis of unity, that of faith, by which she means belief in the incarnate God and in the truth which He reveals ; this belief involves belief in a visible Church, the extension of the Incarnation, inhabited and vivified by the Holy Spirit of God, *guided by a visible Head as Christ's Vicar on earth*, and thus communicating the historical revelation made by Jesus Christ to each successive age of human history. Catholic Reunion means the reunion of Christians in this Church, united in the profession of its faith *which includes, as one of its fundamental tenets, obedience to Christ's Vicar in doctrinal as well as jurisdictional matters.*" For this reason, a Catholic gives a much more binding meaning to the author's words on page nineteen : "The faith is one and indivisible." Therefore, Catholics argue, those who divide that *indivisibility* and in action reject that *oneness* by severing themselves from the See of Rome, which is the centre of indivisibility and oneness in faith, are called, if the severance concerns only matters hierarchical and jurisdictional, *schismatics*, if also it concerns matters doctrinal they are termed *heretics*. Canon Rees will no doubt consider this position rigid ; but principles are always rigid, and according to our Catholic, i.e. Roman Catholic, theology, one who does not believe as above is no longer a Catholic. And we contend that this has always been the historical belief of the Church, in the early ages, ~~in the~~ middle ages, in the present age.

Surely it is in this sense too, that not only the quotations from the "rigid" Innocent III, but also all the others listed by Canon Rees, should be explained. Take, for instance, that of the English Pope Adrian IV : "It has been handed down to us how the holy fathers, illumined by the Divine Spirit, bade the hallowed and holy Roman Church have absolute primacy over all the Churches, and defined that the judgment of all things should be referred to her decision ; do you, for the love of God, for the saving of your soul, and for the attainment of eternal glory, look well to the removing of schism, and the union of the Church" (p. 9). Incidentally, we may note that the Pope here does speak of schism, repeating the word several times, and that he wrote this letter c. 1153. Innocent III (c. 1204) and Gregory IX (1227-1241) make use of the same term (p. 13). Why then does the author

say on a later page (p. 12) : " So far we have observed the interesting spectacle of two hierarchies separated from one another, yet neither charging the other with heresy or *schism* " ?

On page 20, the Canon writes : " This unity of faith can persist in spite of a suspension on intercommunion." True ; but if this implies a *formal* severance of allegiance from the Vicar of Christ, the jurisdictional ties are broken, and this constitutes a *schism*.

May we point also to the statement on page 6 regarding the *Filioque* ? Canon Rees still mentions Reccared as its introducer into Spain ; this, however, has recently proved to be inaccurate : as a matter of fact the *Filioque* was first added to the Creed in 445 by Pastor, Bishop of Palencia, and sanctioned by the Council of Toledo of 447. (Cf. J. A. de Aldama, S.J., *El Simbolo Toledano*, etc., in *Analecta Gregoriana*, Tom. VII, Rome, 1934, pp. 69-71).

In conclusion we may remark that the question of Corporate Reunion is only indirectly affected by the doctrinal issues dealt with above. What really matters is that those who, whether national or hierarchical groups or individuals, reunite themselves with the Catholic Church, do so by accepting " the unity of faith " *in toto*, viz. each and all of the dogmas of the Church, including that of the belief in Christ's visible Vicegerent on earth, vested with the plenitude of hierarchical authority over the whole Church one, Catholic and Apostolic. For this happy event many earnest souls are longing and praying, and among them we venture to include Canon Rees : *Usquequo, Domine, usquequo?* . . .

DOM ROMANUS RIOS.

*Methodism and the Literature of the Eighteenth Century.* By T. B. Shepherd, M.A., Ph.D. pp. 286. The Epworth Press, 10s. 6d.

*The Church and the World.* Vol. III. By C. E. Hudson and M. B. Reckitt. pp. xiv, 256. G. Allen and Unwin, 7s. 6d.

These two books together illuminate aspects of the Anglican Church from the beginning of revival in the eighteenth century to the present day.

In this place we need say no more in commendation of Dr. Shepherd's book than that, although primarily a literary work, it yet throws much light on Methodism as a religious movement. By means of a painstaking and very detailed study of Methodist literature and of references to it in, and its effect on, contemporary writers, a very good impression

is given of the characters of this originally Anglican movement. Catholics will find much in it to edify, as well as to assist them to understand the strength and the limitations of Methodism. Like other bodies it finds its strength in emphasising a fraction of Christian truth, and its limitation in its acceptance of only a fraction. It stresses the Christian's consciousness of salvation and this consequent joy, a somewhat protestantized version of the doctrine (a lack of stress on which in Latin theology is sometimes noted by those of the Eastern tradition) that we have been redeemed by, have risen with Christ, and must therefore rejoice always while seeking the things which are above, not those which are on the earth.

*The Church and the World* is something between a commented book of documents and a narrative history of the social activity and thought of Anglicans during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. It consists largely of quotations, but these are as often from secondary authorities as from original sources. The book is, further, something between a merely historical work and one of theoretical analysis of social problems. It gives an extremely interesting account of Anglican social movements and the solutions they have propounded and are propounding for social problems. Occasional references to the Roman Catholic point of view (the word "Romanist" also occurs!) might have been better omitted as not coming within the scope of the work. Their inclusion gives an erroneous impression that they are as adequate an account of Catholic teaching as is given of Anglican.

Catholics will sympathize with much Anglican thought and action in this field, and much in this book is provocative of serious thought. Here we may note especially Westcott's view (p. 104) that it was "one of the great lessons of Positivism, that by asserting religion to be the complete harmony of man and the Cosmos, it has forced again upon our notice aspects of Christian truth which have been more or less hidden since the teaching of the greatest of the Greek Fathers was superseded in the West by the necessarily narrower system of Latin theology." One of the aims of the Catholic liturgical movement is precisely the recovery of this neglected liturgy-embodied heritage. It is devoutly to be desired that Catholics may increasingly recognize and exploit the treasures of their Faith (parts of which are sometimes to be found so clearly grasped by those outside the Fold), and that all these men of goodwill may awake to full reality and, returning to their Father's house, may be rejoiced to find there in its due place in the unique fullness of the Faith, all

of the true and the good which has been preserved or rediscovered outside.

T.R.

*The Greater English Church.* By Harry Batsford and Charles Fry. (Batsford). pp. 136. 7s. 6d.

This is one of the "British Heritage Series" and comes rather definitely under the head "book-making." It is intended as an "*œuvre de vulgarisation*" and is pleasant to look at, with its many photographs and plans and one or two coloured illustrations. The text would be more satisfactory if the authors assumed that God existed quite actively, both in fact and for the builders of the greater churches, and also if they had a clearer idea of the hierarchy of values in the Christian scheme of things. The whole Christian liturgy is treated as though it were an elaborate form of play-acting to impress the imagination, with processions rather than Mass as its centre. The lack of proportion is shown by the remark, after pages of description of processions and "boy bishops," that "among special services were those for the Ordination of a Priest, the Enthronement of a Bishop and the 'Order for making a Dean,' and various 'occasions of honour'" (p. 30). Ordination and the consecration of bishops are more integral to Christian life than that.

Very little appreciation of Romanesque architecture is shown: for the authors architectural history still begins with "Gothic and all that," when the "gloomy, massive structure" of the "great Romanesque-Benedictine abbey church was transformed into the full-fledged English Cathedral," a "creation of lightness and grace" (p. 50). Happily many now realize the complete satisfaction of the round arch and the steady rhythm of repeating bays. Romanesque, especially Norman Romanesque, is less technically skilled than Gothic, but things are not always more beautiful for being a greater exhibition of skill.

Commenting on the great length of the nave in post-Conquest Benedictine churches (p. 47), the authors remark that "even allowing for an early use of nave altars and the carrying out of certain stages of processional ritual, it is difficult to understand how such vast halls were ever fully used. Even the most extensive congregational worship would not have brought together assemblies sufficient to fill them." Contemporary lives of saints do seem to indicate that vast pilgrim or quasi-pilgrim congregations made very adequate use of the naves of the great abbey churches, though, since

the building itself was for the worship of God, there was no absolute need to proportion it to the exact dimensions of the congregation expected.

The illustrations facing page 27 are erroneously labelled "Black Monks." Number 34, certainly, (the knotted cords are clearly visible) and No. 35, apparently, show the dress not of monks but of friars.

The book deals with the "greater English Church," that is the cathedral, monastic, and greater collegiate church, under six chapter headings : "How it was Used," "How it was Planned," "How it was Built," "How it was Designed," "How it was Furnished," "How it has Survived."

E. J. B. FRY.

### *The Week of Prayer for Christian Unity.*

*Some Thoughts on the Universal Prayer for Christian Unity.* Both by Geoffrey Curtis ("Pax House," Victoria Street).

These are two excellent pamphlets explaining the Crusade of the Universal Prayer for Christian Unity of Abbé P. Courtier. We think it should have been made clear that though the "week of prayer" enlarges and in some ways deepens the spiritual outlook of the Church Unity Octave during whose dates it takes place, it is in no way meant as a substitute. The Bishop of Oxford writes a foreword to both booklets.

### BOOKS RECEIVED.

The Warburg Institute: *The Continuity of the Platonic Tradition during the Middle Ages.* Raymond Klibansky. *Plato Latinus Vol. I. Meno*, Interpretē Henrico Aristippo.

George Allen and Unwin: *Under Four Tudors.* E. Weir-Perry.

B. T. Batsford: *Prehistoric England.* Graham Clark.

Oxford University Press: *Early Churches in Palestine.* J. W. Crowfoot.

S.P.C.K.: *The Life and Times of St. Leo the Great.* Trevor Yalland.